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1 Introduction

The Coherent ERGO reasoner is a sophisticated object-based knowledge representation and reasoning platform. It is based on decades of research into logic rules systems and it presents a unified language of F-logic [9], HiLog [4], Transaction Logic [2, 1], and defeasible reasoning [15].

ERGO is based on the open-source FLORA-2 inference system, also known as ERGO\textsuperscript{Lite}, but is much more scalable and it extends ERGO\textsuperscript{Lite} in numerous ways that are crucial for enterprise use. These extensions and enhancements are proprietary to Coherent Knowledge Systems.

The present document is based on the FLORA-2 manual but is adapted for Coherent needs and expanded with ERGO-specific information.

2 Installation

The ERGO reasoner is part of the Coherent ERGO Suite and comes bundled with ERGO Studio and various ERGO connectors (e.g., to OWL). To install ERGO Suite on Windows, download the ERGO installer, ergo_customer.exe, and then click through the installation process. Note that if you choose to install ERGO in Program Files or some other system directory, you must use an account with administrative privileges not just during the installation but also when using ERGO afterwards. It is therefore generally recommended to install ERGO in a user-owned folder.

For Linux and Mac, the installer is ergosuite.run; it is a self-extracting archive, which you can simply execute as

```
sh ergosuite.run
```

and ERGO Suite will be installed in a subdirectory called Coherent.

To start ERGO via the UI, simply double-click on the Coherent ERGO icon that should appear on your desktop after the installation. If things go wrong on startup, the studio should detect the problem and present an error dialog. If your email client is configured properly, it will also even draft an email bug report and offer you to send it. If the startup was successful, but you encounter a problem later, use the Studio’s bug reporter. It is found in the listener window and is accessible via the menu Tools/Send Bug Report.

If for some reason you prefer to start the ERGO reasoner as a standalone engine on command line, locate the folder where the reasoner is installed and type runergo there. See Section 3 for more details.

---

1 http://flora.sourceforge.net
3 Running ERGO

ERGO is fully integrated into the underlying Prolog engine, including its module system. In particular, ERGO modules can invoke predicates defined in other Prolog modules, and Prolog modules can query the objects defined in ERGO modules. At present, XSB is the only Prolog platform where ERGO can run, because it heavily relies on tabling and the well-founded semantics for negation, both of which are available only in XSB.

The easiest way to get a feel of the system is to start the ERGO shell and enter some queries interactively:

```
.../ergo/runergo
```

Here “...” stands for the directory in which ERGO is installed. For instance,

```
~/ENGINEDIR/ergo/runergo
```

At this point, ERGO takes over and F-logic syntax becomes the norm. To get back to the Prolog command loop, type Control-D (Unix) or Control-Z (Windows), or

```
ergo> \end.
```

If you are using the ERGO shell frequently, it pays to define an alias, say (in Bash):

```
alias ergo='~/ENGINEDIR/ergo/runergo'
```

ERGO can then be invoked directly from the shell prompt by typing `ergo`. It is even possible to tell ERGO to execute commands on start-up. For instance, typing

```
ergo -e "\help."
```

in the command window of your operating system will cause the system to execute the help command right after after the initialization. Then the usual ERGO shell prompt is displayed.

ERGO comes with a number of demos that live in

```
.../ergo/demos/
```

The demos can be run with the command `demo{demo-filename}.` at the ERGO prompt, e.g.,

```
ergo> demo{flogicBasics}.
```

There is no need to change to the demo directory, as `demo{...}` knows where to find these examples.
The initialization file. When ERGO starts up, it first executes the commands found in the initialization file, if it is specified and exists. The initialization file is specified as a value of the ERGO_RC_FILE environment variable of the operating system in use. If this variable is not set or if the value of that variable is not a readable plain file, the initialization file is ignored. The commands in the initialization file can be any kind of ERGO queries or commands. They must be specified exactly as they would be written in the interactive ERGO shell, i.e., without the query prefix “?-” and they must be terminated with the period. For instance, if ERGO_RC_FILE is set to ~/test/myrc (note: the .ergo suffix is not required) and that file contains

```
writeln('Welcome!')\plg.
insert{foo(bar)}.
```

then the message “Welcome!” will be printed and the fact foo(bar) will be inserted into the knowledge base.

There is one restrictions on the initialization file: a comment cannot be the last statement. Also note that the command-line option -e mentioned earlier is executed after all the initialization file commands are processed.

4 ERGO Shell Commands

The ERGO shell (or command line interface) is designed to do what its name says: to accept commands that the user wishes ERGO to execute. These commands can roughly be divided into these categories:

1. **Loading**: commands for loading knowledge base files into ERGO, e.g., `load(...)`, `add(...)`.

2. **System information and control**: various commands that provide information about the state of the system, e.g., `system(...)`, `semantics(...)`, `isloaded(...)`, `\one`, `\trace`.

3. **Execution control**: In ERGO, one can also monitor, examine, stop, and resume execution of running queries, e.g., `setmonitor(...)`.

4. **Knowledge base querying**: ask queries about the user knowledge base, e.g., `Ann[address->?A]` or `?p:Person[phone->?f]`, `fmt_write('%s\’s phone is %s\n\n', args(?p, ?f))\io`. (What is Ann’s address? Find all people and their phones and then print out the result as a block of lines of the form ...’s phone is ....)

These commands all have the form of a rule body — see Section 7.1 for the exact syntax of rule bodies.
Loading knowledge bases from files. The most common shell commands you probably need are the commands for loading and compiling knowledge bases:

```
ergo> [myfile].  // e.g., ['c:/My Documents/data'].
ergo> [url(myurl)]. // e.g., [url('http://example.com/data')].
```

or

```
ergo> load{myfile}.  // e.g., load{'/home/me/proj/kb'}.
ergo> load{url(myurl)}.  
```

Here `myfile` or `myurl` are a file names (respectively, a URL) that are assumed to be pointing to an ERGO knowledge base or a Prolog program. Both `myfile` and URL must be Prolog atoms. If they contain non-alphanumeric characters (as in the examples above) then they must be single-quoted (as usual for Prolog atoms). A URL is expected when the argument has the form `url(myurl)`.

The file can be relative to the directory in which ERGO was started. For instance, if that directory has the file `foo.ergo` then one can simply type `[foo]` instead of `['/home/me/foo.ergo']` or even `['/home/me/foo']`. Note that our first example file, `c:/My Documents/data`, is a Windows file name, except that it uses forward slashes (like in URLs), which is preferred to backward slashes. Backward slashes can also be used in Windows, but they must be doubled: `c:\My Documents\data`. On Unix-based systems, such as Linux and Mac, only forward slashes can be used.

If `myfile.ergo` exists, it is assumed to be a knowledge base written for ERGO. The system will compile the knowledge base, if necessary, and then load it. The compilation process is two-stage: first, the knowledge base is compiled into a Prolog program (one or more files with extensions `.pl`, `.fdb`, and others) and then into an executable byte-code, which has the extension `.xwam`. For instance,

```
ergo> load{url('http://example.com/test1')}.  
ergo> [url('http://example.com/test2')].  
```

will compile (if necessary) and load the ERGO files `test1.ergo` and `test2.ergo` found at the Web site `http://example.com/`.

If there is no `myfile.ergo` file, the file is assumed to contain a Prolog program and the system will look for the file named `myfile.P`. This file then is compiled into `myfile.xwam` and loaded. Note that in this case the program is loaded into a Prolog module of ERGO and, therefore, calls to the predicates defined in that program must use the appropriate module attribution — see Section 16.1 for the details about the module system in ERGO.

---

3 For this to work, the XSB package `curl` must be configured as described in the XSB manual, volume 2.
For backward compatibility with Flora-2, ERGO will also try to compile and load files with the .flr extension, such as program.flr. However, if there are both program.ergo and program.flr then program.flr is ignored unless the .flr extension is explicitly mentioned. For instance, if the command load({'program.flr'}) is executed, then program.flr will be taken even if program.ergo exists. On the other hand, load(program) (without an explicit extension) will try to load program.ergo first. If this file does not exist, program.flr will be tried. If that file is not found, program.P will be attempted followed by program.xwam.

By default, all ERGO knowledge bases are loaded into the module called main, but you can also load into other modules using the following command:

```
load{myfile} modulename
```

Understanding ERGO modules is very important in order to be able to take full advantage of the system; we will discuss the module system of ERGO in Section 16.1. Once the knowledge base is loaded, you can pose queries and invoke methods for the objects defined in that knowledge base.

All the loading commands that apply to files also apply to URLs, so in the future we will be giving examples for files only.

There is an important special case of the `load{...}` and `[...]` commands when the file name is missing. In that case, ERGO creates a scratchpad file and starts reading user input. At this point, the user can start typing in ERGO clauses, which the system saves in a scratchpad file. When the user is done and types the end of file character Control-D (Unix) or Control-Z (Windows), the file is compiled and loaded. It is also possible to load the scratchpad file into a designated module, rather than the default one, using one of the following commands:

```
load{>>module}.
load{>>module}.
```

Adding rulebases to modules. When the `load{...}` command loads a rule base into a module, it first wipes out all the rules and facts that previously formed the knowledge base of that module. Sometimes it is desirable to add the facts and rules contained in a certain file to the already existing knowledge base of a module. This operation, called `add{...}`, does not erase the old knowledge base in the module in question. It is also possible to use the `[...]` syntax by prefixing the file name with a +-sign. Here are some examples of adding a rulebase contained in files to existing modules:

```
[+foo].
[+foo>>bar].
```
ergo> add{foo}.

ergo> add{foo>>bar}.

When using the [...] syntax, adding and loading can be intermixed. For instance,

ergo> [foo>>bar, +foo2>>bar].

This first loads the file foo.ergo into the module bar and then adds the rule base contained in foo2.ergo to the same module.

Reloading and re-adding. Recomilation. ERGO’s load{...} and add{...} commands try to be smart in order to simplify maintenance of knowledge bases and to avoid undesirable side effects. First, reloading and re-adding the same file to the same module will have no effect unless one of the dependent files has changed since the previous load/add. So, cyclic add/load commands are harmless, albeit they constitute evidence of bad design.

For the purpose of recompilation, a dependent file is one that is included with the #include compiler directive. The dependent property is transitive, so if any of the dependent files downstream from the parent changes, loading or adding the parent file will cause that parent to be recompiled.

Similar relationship exists with respect to the load/add dependency. Normally, as we said, reloading a file will have no effect. But what if the file being loaded (or added) has an explicit load/add command that loads another file (which we call load-dependent)? If the dependent file was changed since the last loading, it needs to be reloaded and recompiled. In this case, if the parent file is reloaded then this reloading will take place and so all the load/add commands in that file will be re-executed causing the reloading of all the relevant load-dependent files. Such loading will take place if any of the load-dependents changes—at any level down-stream from the parent.

Reporting query answers. When the user types in a query to the shell, the query is evaluated and the results are returned. A result is a tuple of values for each variable mentioned in the query, except for the anonymous variables represented as “?_” or ?, and named don’t care variables, which are preceded with the underscore, e.g., ?_abc.

By default, ERGO prints out all answers (if their number is finite). If only one at a time is desired, type in the following command: \one. You can revert back to the all-answers mode by typing \all. Note: \one and \all affect only the subsequent queries. That is, in

ergo> \one, goallist1.

ergo> goallist2.
the output control command \one will affect goallist2, but not goallist1. This is because goallist1 executes in the same statement as \one and thus is not affected by this directive.

The ERGO shell includes many more commands beyond those mentioned above. These commands are listed below. However, at this point the purpose of some of these commands might seem a bit cryptic, so it is a good idea to come back here after you become more familiar with the various concepts underlying the system.

System information. The system{...} command can be used to obtain information about the current version of ERGO and the underlying OS. For instance,

\begin{verbatim}
  ergo> system{system=?X}.
  ?X = Ergo
  ergo> system{version=?X}.
  ?X = '1.3'
  ergo> system{info=?X}.
  ?X = 'Ergo 1.3 (Zeno; build: aa9225b, 2018-01-27) on x86_64-unknown-linux-gnu'
\end{verbatim}

To see all the available system information and all the valid properties that can be used in the system{...} command, ask the query system{?X}.

Summary of shell commands. In the following command list, the suffixes .ergo .P, .xwam are optional. If the file suffix is specified explicitly, the system uses the file with the given name without any modification. The .ergo suffix denotes an ERGO knowledge base, the .P suffix indicates that it is a Prolog program, and .xwam means that it is a bytecode file, which can be executed by Prolog. If no suffix is given, the system assumes it is dealing with an ERGO knowledge base and adds the suffix .ergo. If the file with such a name does not exist, it assumes that the file contains a Prolog program and tries the suffix .P. Otherwise, it tries .xwam in the hope that an executable Prolog bytecode exists. If none of these tries are successful, an error is reported.

- \help: Show the help info.
- system{param}: Show system information.
- compile{file}: Compile file.ergo for the default module main.
- compile{file>>module}: Compile file.ergo for the module module.
- load{file>>module}: Load file.ergo into the module module. If you specify file.P or file.xwam then it will load those files.
• `load{file}`: Load file.ergo into the default module `main`. If you specify `file.P` or `file.xwam` then will load these files.

• `compile{file}`: Compile FILE.ergo for adding to the default module `main`.

• `compileadd{file>>module}`: Compile FILE.ergo for adding to the module `module`.

• `add{file>>module}`: Add file.ergo to the module `module`.

• `add{file}`: Add file.ergo to the default module `main`.

• `[file.{P|xwam|flr} >> module,...]`: Load the files in the specified list into the module `module`. The files can optionally be prefixed with a “+”, which means that the file should be added to the module rather than loaded into it.

• `setmonitor{Secs, Type}`: Start monitoring query execution. Statistics will be printed to the standard output every `Secs` seconds. `Type` is the type of the monitor. The `heartbeat` monitor just shows the elapsed time. The `performance` monitor shows time, memory, and other key statistics. The `extended` monitor shows additional statistics of interest.

• `demo{demofilename}`: Consult a demo from ERGO demos directory.

• `op{Precedence, Associativity, Operator}`: Define an operator in shell mode.

• `\all`: Show all solutions (default). Affects subsequent queries only.

• `\one`: Show solutions to subsequent queries one by one.

• `\trace and \notrace`: Turn on/off ERGO trace.

• `chatter{on} and chatter{off}`: Turn on/off the display of the number of solutions at the end of each query evaluation.

• `feedback{on} and feedback{off}`: Turn on/off the display of query answers. Mostly used in Java applications.

• `setwarnings{type}`: Control the types of warnings to be shown to the user.
  
  – `all` — show all warnings (default)
  
  – `off` — do not show any warnings
  
  – `compiler=on, compiler=off` — turn compiler warnings on (default) or off; no effect on other types of warnings
  
  – `dependency=on/off` — turn dependency checker warnings on (default) or off; does not affect other types of warnings
runtime=on/off — turn runtime warnings on (default) or off; does not affect other types of warnings.

• warnings{?Type}: tell which warning control options are in effect. ?Type can be a variable or a pattern like compiler=?X.

• \end: Say Ciao to ERGO, but stay in Prolog. You can still re-enter ERGO by executing the ergo_shell command at the Prolog prompt.

• \halt: Quit both ERGO and Prolog.

Of course, many other executable directives and queries can be executed at the ERGO shell. These are described further in this manual

In general, ERGO built-in predicates whose name is of the form fl[A-Z]... are either the ERGO shell commands or predicates that can be used in Prolog to control the execution of ERGO modules. We will discuss the latter in Section 16.8. Some of these commands — mostly dealing with loading and compilation of ERGO modules — can also be useful within ERGO applications.

All commands with a FILE argument passed to them use the Prolog library_directory predicate to search for the file, except that the command demo{FILE} first looks for FILE in the ERGO demo directory. The search path typically includes the standard system’s directories used by Prolog followed by the current directory.

All Prolog commands can be executed from ERGO shell, if the corresponding Prolog library has already been loaded.

After a parsing or compilation error, ERGO shell will discard tokens read from the current input stream until the end of file or a rule delimiter (“.”) is encountered. If ERGO shell seems to be hanging after the message

++Warning[ERGO]: discarding tokens (rule delimiter ‘.’ or EOF expected)

hit the Enter key once, type “.”, and then Enter again. This should reset the current input buffer and you should see the ERGO command prompt:

ergo>

5 F-logic and ERGO by Example

In the future, this section will present a number of introductory examples illustrating the use of F-logic and ERGO. In addition, the reader can consult the ERGO tutorials available on the Coherent
6 Main Syntactic Elements of ERGO

ERGO has rich syntax, so it is useful to first list the various types of statements one may encounter in this manual. First, we should note that ERGO does not have any alphanumeric reserved keywords, so the user is not restricted in that name space in any way. The only reserved keywords are those that start with a backslash, e.g., \and, \or, \if, etc.

The main types of ERGO statements are compiler and runtime directives, rules, queries, latent queries, and facts. The basic syntax of these statements is described in Section 7.1 and additional features are introduced in subsequent sections.

- **Compiler directives** have the form

  \[ :- \text{directiveName}\{\text{arguments}\}. \]

  Some directives do not have arguments. Compiler directives affect the compilation of the file in which they appear—typically the semantic and optimization options.

- **Runtime directives** have the form

  \[ ?- \text{directiveName}\{\text{arguments}\}. \]

  Runtime directives are typically used to change the semantics of the runtime environment at run time.

- **Rules** have the form

  \[ @!\{\text{statementDescriptors}\} \ \text{ruleHead} :- \text{ruleBody}. \]

  Rules constitute the key part of an ERGO knowledge base as they (along with the class hierarchy) represent the actual knowledge. The presence of rules is the main difference between knowledge bases and mere databases.
The statement descriptor part (@!{...}) is optional. The body of a rule is sometimes also called a premise.

Rules usually appear in files and are added to the system when these files are loaded or added to modules. Less often, they may also be worked with in the ERGO shell. For instance, they can be inserted via the statements insert{...}, insertrule{...}, deleted (via delete{...}, etc.), enabled, disabled (enable{...}, disable{...}), and queried (via clause{...}). See Sections 27, 29, and 36.2. All these commands can be used not just in the shell but also in the bodies of rules and in queries that appear in files.

- **Queries** have the form

  \[- ruleBody.\]

  Syntactically queries have the same form as the rule bodies, but they use the symbol “?-” to distinguish the two. Queries are used to request information from the knowledge base.

  **Note:** the prefix “?-” in front of a query is used only if the query is in a file. In the ERGO shell, this prefix is not used (and will cause a syntax error) because the shell expects queries only—typing rules, directives and other constructs will cause errors to be issued.

- **Latent queries** have the form

  @!{statementDescriptors} !- ruleBody.

  Latent queries are similar to regular queries. However, regular queries are immediate requests for information from the knowledge base, while latent queries are requests that intended to be posed at a later time. A latent query also has descriptors, which are used to refer to the query and to invoke it.

- **Facts** are statements that are considered to be unconditionally true. They have the form

  @!{statementDescriptors} ruleHead.

  Syntactically and conceptually, a fact is a rule without a premise. The descriptor part of the syntax for facts is optional.

  **Note:** a simple fact (without the optional descriptor) looks like a query without the “?-” prefix. A novice might make a mistake by typing facts into the ERGO shell, expecting that these facts will be inserted into the knowledge base. However, since the shell expects queries only, this will result in these facts being asked as queries and most likely getting the answer No. To insert queries (and rules) via the ERGO shell, use the insert{...} command—see Section 27.
Rule heads, bodies, queries, and their arguments are typically composed out of base formulas with the help of connectives, such as conjunction, disjunction, the various negations, and more. The main forms of base formulas are

- **F-logic frames** are used for object-oriented knowledge representation.
- **HiLog predicates** are used for more traditional knowledge representation. However, in ERGO, predicates can be higher-order and variables are allowed to range over them.

The different types of frames and predicates are described in the respective sections. The main components used to construct predicates and frames include:

- **Variables**, which are expressions of the form `$?Varname$`.
- **Constants**, which includes symbols, strings, numbers, and various other data types. There are certain builtin constants, like `$true$`, `$false$`, and `$undefined$`, which represent the three truth values in ERGO: `true`, `false`, and `undefined`.
- **Operators**, including arithmetic operators.
- **Quasi-constants** and **quasi-variables**. Quasi-constants are symbols that get substituted with real constants at compile time or at the time the knowledge base is loaded. Examples of quasi-constants are `$\&F$` and `$\&L$`, which get substituted with the file name and the line number in which these constants occur. Quasi-constants let one write statements that refer to objects, such as the file name or line number, which are either unknown at the time of writing or may change later. Quasi-constants never change during runtime—it is just that their values are typically unknown at the time these constants are written into the knowledge base by the knowledge engineer.

As example of a quasi-variable is `$?C$`. This variable can appear in the body of a rule and it gets substituted with the name of the module that invoked that rule. This is a quasi-variable because it gets instantiated by the runtime system and is not under the control of the knowledge engineer. It is a variable (rather than a constant) because it may get instantiated with different values during runtime (because, different modules may invoke the same rule).

- **Auxiliary symbols**, such as `->`, `!`, `[]`, `{}`, `[]`, etc., are used to glue together the aforesaid components to form base formulas.
7 Basic ERGO Syntax

In this section we describe the basic syntactic structures used to specify ERGO knowledge base. Subsequent sections describe the various advanced features that are needed to build practical applications. The complete syntax is given in Appendix A. However, it should be noted that BNF cannot describe the syntax of ERGO precisely, because it is based on operator grammar (as in Prolog) mixed with context free grammars in places where operator grammar is inadequate (as, for example, in parsing if-then-else).

7.1 F-logic Vocabulary

- **Symbols**: The F-logic alphabet of object constructors consists of the sets \( C \) and \( V \) (constants and variables). Variables are symbols that begin with a questionmark, followed by a letter or an underscore, and then followed by zero or more letters and/or digits and/or underscores (e.g., \(?x, ?name, ?_\text{name}, ?_\text{_v}_5\)). All other symbols, including the constants (which are 0-ary object constructors), are symbols that start with a letter followed by zero or more letters and/or digits and/or underscores (e.g., \( a, John, v_10 \)). They are called general constant symbols or Prolog atoms. General constant symbols can also be any sequence of symbols enclosed in single quotes (e.g., ‘AB@*c’). Later, in Section 41, we introduce additional constants, called typed literals.

In addition to the usual first-order connectives and symbols, ERGO has a number of special symbols: \[, \], \{, \}, \{, ", ", ", ", \%, \#, \\#, \#, ->, =>, ;, ::, -->, ->, :=; \}, etc.

- **Numeric constants**: These include integers, like 123 or 5063; decimals of the form 123.45; or floating point numbers, like 12.345e12 (\(= 12.345 \times 10^{12}\)), 0.34e+3 (same as 0.34e3), or 360.1e-2 (\(= 360.1 \times 10^{-2}\)).

- **Anonymous and don’t care variables**: Variables of the form \(?_\) or ? are called anonymous variable. They are used whenever a unique new variable name is needed. In particular, two different occurrences of \(?_\) or ? in the same clause are treated as different variables. Named variables that start with \(?_\), e.g., \(?_\text{foo}\), are called don’t care variables. Unlike anonymous variables, two different occurrences of such a variable in the same clause refer to the same variable. Nevertheless, don’t care variables have special status when it comes to error checking and returning answers. The practice of logic programming shows that a singleton occurrence of a variable in a clause is often a mistake due to misspelling. Therefore, ERGO issues a warning when it finds that some variable is mentioned only once in a clause. If such an occurrence is truly intended, it must be replaced by an anonymous variable or a don’t care variable to avoid the warning message from ERGO. Also, bindings for anonymous and don’t care variables are not returned as answers.
• **Id-Terms/Oids:** Instead of the regular first-order terms used in Prolog, ERGO uses HiLog terms. HiLog terms [4] generalize first-order terms by allowing variables in the position of function symbols and even other terms can serve as functors. For instance, \( p(a)(?X(f,b)) \) is a legal HiLog term. Formally, a HiLog term is a constant, a variable, or an expression of the form \( t(t_1, ..., t_n) \) where \( t, t_1, ..., t_n \) is a HiLog term.

HiLog terms over \( C \) and \( V \) are called *Id-terms*, and are used to name objects, methods, and classes. Ground Id-terms (i.e., terms with no variables) correspond to *logical object identifiers* (oids), also called object names. Numbers (including integers and floats) can also be used as Id-terms, but such use might be confusing and is not recommended.

• **Base formulas:** Let \( O, M, R, X, C, D, T \) be Id-terms. In addition to the usual first-order predicate formulas, like \( p(X_1, \ldots, X_n) \), ERGO allows higher-order HiLog base formulas of the form \( ?X(s, ?Y), ?X(f, ?Y)(?X, g(k)) \), etc., where \( ?X \) and \( ?Y \) are variables, while the symbols not prefixed with a \( ? \) are constants. Furthermore, the following *frame* formulas are supported in ERGO:

1. \( O[M -> V], C[M -> V1] \)
2. \( O[M -> \{V_1, ..., V_n\}], C[M -> \{V_1, ..., V_n\}] \)
3. \( O[M -> T], C[M -> T1], C[M{L..H} -> T] \)
4. \( O[V], C[V1] \)
5. \( O[= T], C[= T1] \)
6. \( O[ ], C[= ] \)

Here \( O, C, M, V_1, T_1 \) are HiLog terms of the form \( a, f(?X), ?X(s, ?Y), ?X(f, ?Y)(?X, g(k)) \), etc., where \( ?X \) and \( ?Y \) are variables and \( f, s, \) etc., are constants.

Expressions (1) and (2) above are *data frames* for *value-returning* methods. They specify that a *method expression* \( M \) applied to an object \( O \) returns the result object \( V \) in case (1), or a set of objects, \( V_1, ..., V_n \), in case (2). In all cases, methods are assumed to be set-valued. However, later we will see that cardinality constraints can be imposed on methods, so it would be possible to state that a particular method is functional or has some other cardinality constraints. The formula (2) says that the result consists of several objects, which *includes* \( V_1, V_2, ..., V_n \). Note that we emphasized “includes” to make it plain that other facts and rules in the knowledge base can specify additional objects that must be included among the method result.

In (1) and (2), when \( M \) is a constant, e.g., abc, then we say that it is an *attribute* or a *property*; for example, \( \text{John123[name} -> 'John Doe'] \). When \( M \) has the form \( f(X, Y, Z) \) then we refer to it as a method \( f \) with arguments \( X, Y, \) and \( Z \); for example, \( \text{John123[salary(2017) -> 50000]} \).
However, as we saw earlier, method expressions can be much more general than these two possibilities: they can be arbitrary HiLog terms.

The formulas in (1) and (2) that use \([\ldots]\) apply to classes and specify the default values inherited by the objects that belong to those classes. To make it easier to remember, we use the letter \(C\) in those cases. The letter \(O\) (for “object”) is used with formulas of the form \([\ldots]\), which apply to individual objects and specify concrete values of their attributes/methods as opposed to the default values inherited from superclasses. These concepts are explained in greater detail in Section 22.

The expression (3) above is a signature frame (or typing frame). It specifies a type constraint that says that the method expression, \(M\), when applied to objects that belong to class \(C\), must yield objects that belong to class \(T\). The first form of type constraints in (3) applies to individual objects, the second to classes, and this second form is inherited by subclasses and individual objects. Third, while also applying to classes, imposes a cardinality constraint on the possible number of values \(T\) that can correspond to the same \(M\). Here \(L>0\) is a number that specifies the lower bound on that number of values and \(H\) specifies the upper limit. See Section 22 for additional details on this type of formulas.

Note: \(\mathcal{ERGO}\) does not automatically enforce type constraints. However, one can request that an integrity constraint is to be maintained automatically, as described in Section 38. Also, run-time type checking is possible—see Section 45.2.

The form (4) is used for Boolean methods. Unlike the methods in (1) and (2), Boolean methods can be either true or false: they do not return any values. Apart from that, the previous conventions apply: \(O[V]\) says that object \(O\) has a Boolean property \(V\) and \(C[V]\) says that class \(C\) has a default Boolean property that is inherited by \(C\)'s subclasses and member objects.

The form (5) specifies signatures, i.e., types for the formulas in (4). Note that, unlike in (3), cardinality constraints do not apply in this case.

Empty frames. Normally, a frame has at least one statement about the frame’s object, as in

\[
\text{John[spouse \rightarrow Mary]}
\]

However, as seen from case (6) above, a frame can also be empty like this: e.g.,

\[
\text{Mary[\ ]}
\]

\[
\text{Mary[| ]}
\]

Here we have an empty object specification and an empty class signature. This is to be interpreted as a statement that the corresponding object (\(\text{Mary}\), in our case) is known to exist in the domain of discourse. This means that some statement about that object is derivable from user specifications. For instance, if the knowledge base has statements that
imply, say, \texttt{Mary:person, Mary[age -> 25]}, or if the “empty” fact \texttt{Mary[]} exists in the knowledge base, then \texttt{Mary[]} holds true. This rule excludes built-in datatypes (see Section 41), such as \texttt{\textasciitilde integer}, \texttt{\textasciitilde object}, and \texttt{\textasciitilde symbol}. For instance, even though \texttt{2:integer} and \texttt{foobar:object} are true, by definition, both \texttt{2[]} and \texttt{foobar[]} would be false unless these facts are implied by other parts of the knowledge base given by the user, i.e., unless the user “told” the knowledge base about the existence of these objects.

Objects are grouped into classes using what we call \textit{ISA-literals}, which account both for class membership and subclass relationships:

5. \texttt{O : C}
6. \texttt{C : : D}

The expression (5) states that \texttt{O} is an \textit{instance} of class \texttt{C}, while (6) states that \texttt{C} is a \textit{subclass} of \texttt{D}.

User-defined equality

7. \texttt{O1 :=: O2}

enables the user to state that two syntactically different (and typically non-unifiable) terms represent the same object. For instance, one can assert that \texttt{a :=: b} and from then on everything that is true about \texttt{a} will be true about \texttt{b}, and vice versa. Note that this is different and more powerful than the unification-based equality built-in \texttt{=} which exists both in \texttt{ERGO} and Prolog. For instance, \texttt{=} based formulas can never occur as a fact or in a rule head, and \texttt{a = b} is always false. More on user-defined equality in Section 23.1.

8. \textit{Composite frames}.

F-logic frames (or \textit{frame literals}) and ISA-literals, can be combined in various ways, reducing long conjunctions into very compact forms. For instance, the conjunction of \texttt{John:person, Bill:Student, John[age -> 31], John[children -> Bob], John[children -> Mary], John[children -> Bill], and Mary[age -> 5]} can be compacted into the following complex frame:

\begin{center}
\texttt{John:person[age -> 31, children -> \{Bob, Mary[age -> 5], Bill:Student\}}
\end{center}

Note that this shows that frames can be nested (e.g., \texttt{Mary[age -> 5]}) and values pertaining to the same method and object can be grouped into sets (e.g., \texttt{John[children -> \{Bob, Mary, Bill\}]}). Furthermore, ISA-literals can be attached both to the outermost object as well as the inner ones (as in \texttt{John:person} and \texttt{Bill:Student}).
Atomic formulas. The base formulas of the types (1)-(7) above are called atomic formulas. Atomic formulas are also base formulas, but the latter can also contain non-atomic formulas: complex frames.

Rules are constructs of the form head:-body, where

- head is a frame/HiLog literal or a conjunction of such literals. These literals can also be negated with \neg. and
- body is a conjunction and/or disjunction of frame/HiLog literals or negated (with \+, \neg, or \naf) frame/HiLog literals. Each rule must be terminated with a “.”.

Conjunction is specified, as in Prolog, using the “,” symbol but \and is also accepted. Disjunction is denoted using the semicolon symbol “;” or using \or. Negation is specified using \+, \neg, or \naf— the difference will be explained later. For example,

\[
p(?X), \neg ?Y[foo->bar(?X)] :- (q(?X,?Y) \or ?X[foo->moo,abc->cde(?Y)]), \naf w(?X).
\]

Subsequent chapters describe many additional constructs that can appear in rule bodies. Also, compared to FLORA-2, ERGO supports much richer syntax in the rule heads as well, including disjunction and quantifiers. See Section 21 for details.

As usual in logic languages, a single rule with a disjunction in the body

\[
head :- John[age->31], \nonumber \\
\quad (John[children->{Bob,Mary}] ; John[children->Bill]).
\]  

(1)

is equivalent to the following pair of rules:

\[
head :- John[age->31], John[children->{Bob,Mary}].
\]

head :- John[age->31], John[children->Bill].

Disjunction is also allowed inside frame literals. For instance, rule (1) can be equivalently rewritten as:

\[
head :- John[age->31], (children->{Bob,Mary} ; children->Bill)].
\]

Note that the conjunction “,” binds stronger than disjunction “;”, so the parentheses in the above example are essential.

Knowledge bases and queries: A knowledge base is a set of rules. A query is a rule without the head. In ERGO, such headless rules use ?- instead of :-, e.g.,

?- John[age->?X].
The symbol `:-` in headless ERGO expressions is used for various directives, which are plenty and will be introduced in due course.

**Note:** In the ERGO shell, the “?-” query prefix should not be used, as the shell expects queries only anyway, so putting the prefix in the shell is redundant and will cause a syntax error.

### Example 7.1 (Publications Database)

Figure 1 depicts a fragment of a ERGO knowledge base that represents a database of scientific publications.

**Schema:**

- `paper[authors => person, title => string].`
- `journal_p :: paper[in_vol => volume].`
- `conf_p :: paper[at_conf => conf_proc].`
- `journal_vol :: paper[of => journal, volume => integer, number => integer, year => integer].`
- `journal :: name => string, publisher => string, editors => person].`
- `conf_proc :: at_conf => conf_series, year => integer, editors => person].`
- `conf_series :: name => string].`
- `publisher :: name => string].`
- `person :: name => string, affil(integer) => institution].`
- `institution :: name => string, address => string].`

**Objects:**

- `o_j1 : journal_p [title => 'Records, Relations, Sets, Entities, and Things', authors => {o_mes}, in_vol => o_i11].`
- `o_di : conf_p [title => 'DIAM II and Levels of Abstraction', authors => {o_mes, o_eba}, at_conf => o_v76].`
- `o_i11 : journal_vol [of => o_is, number => 1, volume => 1, year => 1975].`
- `o_is : journal [name => 'Information Systems', editors => {o_mj}].`
- `o_v76 : conf_proc [of => vldb, year => 1976, editors => {o_pcl, o_ejn}].`
- `o_vldb : conf_series [name => 'Very Large Databases'].`
- `o_mes : person [name => 'Michael E. Senko'].`
- `o_mj : person [name => 'Matthias Jarke', affil(1976) => o_rwt].`
- `o_rwt : institution [name => 'RWTH_Aachen'].`

**Figure 1:** A Publications Object Base and its Schema in ERGO

### 7.2 Symbols, Strings, and Comments

**Symbols.** ERGO symbols (that are used for the names of constants, predicates, and object constructors) begin with a letter followed by zero or more letters (A...Z,a...z), digits (0...9), or
underscores (_), e.g., \textit{student}, \textit{apple\_pie}. Symbols can also be \textit{any} sequence of characters enclosed in a pair of single quotes, e.g., \textit{’JOHN SMITH’, ‘default.ergo’}. Internally, \textit{\texttt{\textsc{ergo}}} symbols are represented as \textit{Prolog symbols}, which are also called Prolog atoms. They are typically used as names of predicates and function symbols. All \textit{\texttt{\textsc{ergo}}} symbols belong to the class \texttt{\symbol{}}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Escaped Sequence</th>
<th>ASCII (decimal)</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\ \</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\n or \N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NewLine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\t or \T</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\r or \R</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\v or \V</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Vertical Tab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\b or \B</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Backspace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\f or \F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Form Feed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\e or \E</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Escape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\d or \D</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\s or \S</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Whitespace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Escaped Character Sequences and Their Corresponding Symbols

\textit{\texttt{\textsc{ergo}}} also recognizes escape sequences inside single quotes (’, symbols). An escape sequence begins with a backslash (\`). Table 1 lists the special escape character sequences and their corresponding special symbols. An escape sequence can also represent a Unicode character. Such a character is preceded with a backslash followed by the letters \texttt{x}, \texttt{u}, \texttt{X}, or \texttt{U} followed by 1 to 8 hexadecimal digits (0–F) representing the character’s Unicode value. The sequence of digits must be terminated with a vertical bar, |. For example, \texttt{\texttt{\textbackslash x0D}|} is the ASCII character Carriage Return, \texttt{\texttt{\textbackslash x0D}|} represents the semicolon, while \texttt{\textbackslash u05D0|} is the Hebrew letter Alef. In other contexts, a backslash is recognized as itself.

If it is necessary to include a quote inside a quoted symbol, that single quote must be escaped by another single quote, e.g., \textit{’isn’t’} or by a backslash, e.g., \textit{’isn’\textbackslash’t’}.

Numbers. Normal \textit{\texttt{\textsc{ergo}}} integers are decimals represented by a sequence of digits, e.g., 892, 12. \textit{\texttt{\textsc{ergo}}} also recognizes integers in other bases (2 through 36). The base is specified by a decimal integer followed by a single quote (’). The digit string immediately follows the single quote. The letters \texttt{A}…\texttt{Z} or \texttt{a}…\texttt{z} are used to represent digits greater than 9. Table 2 lists a few example integers.

Underscore (_) can be put inside any sequence of digits as delimiters. It is used to partition some long numbers. For instance, \texttt{2’11_1111_1111} is the same as \texttt{2’1111111111}. However, “_” cannot be the first symbol of an integer, since variables can start with an underscore. For example, \texttt{1_2_3} represents the number 123 whereas \texttt{?_12_3} represents a variable named \texttt{?_12_3}.

Floating point numbers normally look like \texttt{24.38}. The decimal point must be preceded by an
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integer</th>
<th>Base (decimal)</th>
<th>Value (decimal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1023</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2'1111111111</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8'17777</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16'3FF</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32'vv</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Representation of Integers

integral part, even if it is 0, e.g., 0.3 must be entered as 0.3, but not as .3. Each floating number may also have an optional exponent. It begins with a lowercase e or an uppercase E followed by an optional minus sign (–) or plus sign (+) and an integer. This exponent is recognized as in base 10. For example, 2.43E2 is 243 whereas 2.43e-2 is 0.0243.

Other data types. ERGO supports an array of primitive data types, including string, Boolean, dateTime, iri, and more. Primitive data types are described in Section 41.

Comments. ERGO supports two kinds of comments: (1) all characters following // until the end of the line; (2) all characters inside a pair of /* and */. Note that only (2) can span multiple lines.

Comments are recognized as whitespace by the compiler. Therefore, tokens can also be delimited by comments.

7.3 Operators

As in Prolog, ERGO allows the user to define operators, to make the syntax more natural. There are three kinds of operators: infix, prefix, and postfix. An infix operator appears between its two arguments, while a prefix operator appears in front of its single argument. A postfix operator is written after its single argument. For instance, if foo is defined as an infix operator, then ?X foo a will be parsed as foo(?X,a) and if bar is a postfix operator then ?X bar is parsed as bar(?X).

Each operator has a precedence level, which is a positive integer. Each operator also has a type. The possible types for infix operators are: xfx, xfy, yfx; the possible types for prefix operators are: fx, fy; and the possible types for postfix operators are: xf, yf. In each of these expressions, f stands for the operator, and x and y stand for the arguments. The symbol x in an operator expression means that the precedence level of the corresponding argument should be strictly less than that of the operator, while y means that the precedence level of the corresponding argument should be less than or equal to that of the operator.

The precedence level and the type together determine the way the operators are parsed. The
general rule is that precedence of a constant or a functor symbol that has not been defined as an operator is zero. Precedence of a Prolog term is the same as the precedence of its main functor. An expression that contains several operators is parsed in such a way that the operator with the highest precedence level becomes the main functor of the parsed term, the operator with the next-highest precedence level becomes the main functor of one of the arguments, and so on. If an expression cannot be parsed according to this rule, a parse error is reported.

It is not our goal to cover the use of operators in any detail, since this information can be found in any book on Prolog. Here we just give an example that illustrates the main points. For example, in ERGO, - has precedence level 800 and type yfx, * has precedence level 700 and type yfx, -> has precedence level 1100 and type xfx. Therefore, 8-2-3*4 is the same as -(-(8,2),*(3,4)) in prefix notation, and a -> b -> c will generate a parsing error.

Any symbol can be defined as an operator. The general syntax is

\[ \text{:- op\{Precedence,Type,Name\}.} \]

For instance,

\[ \text{:- op\{800, xfx, foo\}} \]

As a notational convenience, the argument Name can also be a list of operator names of the same type and precedence level, for instance,

\[ \text{:- op\{800,yfx,[+,-]\}.} \]

It is possible to have more than one operator with the same name provided they have different uses (e.g., one infix and the other postfix). However, the ERGO built-in operators are not allowed to be redefined. In particular, any symbol that is part of F-logic syntax, such as “,” “;” “+” “.” “->” “::” “?-” and many other parts of ERGO syntax are operators. Therefore, there is a chance that precedence levels chosen for the user-defined operators may conflict with those of ERGO and, as a result, your specification might not parse. If in doubt, check the declarations in the file flroperator.P in the ERGO source code.

Although this simple rule is sufficient, in most cases, to keep you out of trouble, you should be aware of the fact that symbols such as “,” “;” “+” “.” “->” “::” “?-” and many other parts of ERGO syntax are operators. Therefore, there is a chance that precedence levels chosen for the user-defined operators may conflict with those of ERGO and, as a result, your specification might not parse. If in doubt, check the declarations in the file flroperator.P in the ERGO source code.

The fact that some symbols are operators can sometimes lead to surprises. For instance,

\[ \text{?- (a,b,c).} \]
\[ \text{:- (a,b).} \]
will be interpreted as terms ‘?-’(a,b,c) and ‘:-’(a,b) rather than a query and a directive, respectively. The reason for this is that, first, such terms are allowed in Prolog and there is no good reason to ban them in ERGO; and, second, the above syntax is ambiguous and the parser makes the choice that is consistent with the choice made in Prolog. Typically, users do not put parentheses around subgoals in such cases, and would instead write

?- a,b,c.
:- a,b.

Note that things like

?- (a,b),c.
?- ((a,b,c))

will be interpreted as queries, so there are plenty of ways to satisfy one’s fondness for redundant parentheses.

7.4 Logical Expressions

In a ERGO, any combination of conjunction, disjunction, and negation of literals can appear wherever a logical formula is allowed, e.g., in a rule body.

Conjunction is made with the infix operator “,” and disjunction is made using the infix operator “;”. Negation is specified using the prefix operators “\+” and “\naf”.\footnote{In brief, “\+” represents Prolog-style negation, which does not have an acceptable logical semantics. It is useful, however, when applied to non-tabled Prolog predicates, F-logic frames, or HiLog predicates. “\naf”, on the other hand, is negation that implements the logical well-founded semantics. Refer to Section 19 for more information on the difference between negation operators.} When parentheses are omitted, conjunction binds stronger than disjunction and the negation operators bind their arguments stronger than the other logical operators. For example, in ERGO the following expression: a, b; c, \naf d, is equivalent to the logical formula: (a \land b) \lor (c \land \lnot d)).

Logical formulas can also appear inside the frame specification of an object. For instance, the following frame:

o[\naf att1->val1, att2->val2; meth->res]

is equivalent to the following formula:

(\naf o[att1->val1], o[att2->val2]); o[meth->res]
7.5 Arithmetic (and related) Expressions

In ERGO arithmetic expressions are not always evaluated. As in Prolog, the arithmetic operators such as +, −, /, and *, are defined as normal binary functors. To evaluate an arithmetic expression, ERGO provides another operator, \is. For example, ?X \is 3+4 will bind ?X to the value 7. In addition, ERGO provides a powerful feature of inline evaluation of such expressions, which allows these expressions to appear as arguments to predicates and frames, and be automatically evaluated at runtime. Ergo also provides a number of additional operators, including list/set append/union/intersect, and difference, and string concatenation, which also automatically converts arbitrary terms to their printable form.

When dealing with arithmetic expressions, the order of literals is sometimes important. The comparison and evaluation operators for which the order is unimportant (the logical operators) are:

- >, <, =<, >=
- !=, !==, =:=, =\=
- \is
- \~, \~-, !~

The operators for which the order is important (the non-logical operators) are:

- ==
- \=, \==, ?=
- @<, @>

Logical operators commute among themselves, but non-logical operators generally do not commute with either logical or non-logical operators, and different orders of these operators in an expression may produce different results. For instance, if ?X is not bound then ?X == abc, ?X = abc will fail, while ?X = abc, ?X == abc will succeed with ?X = abc. The reason for this is, of course the non-logical operator ==.

Arithmetic expression must be instantiated at the time of evaluation. Otherwise, a runtime error will occur. However, ERGO tries to delay the evaluation of arithmetic expressions until the variables become bound and it will issue a runtime error only if it determines that some variable will never get bound. For instance,

?- ?X > 1, ?X \is 1+1.
will not produce an error, while the following query will:

?- ?X > 1.

As in Prolog, the operands of an arithmetic expression can be any variable or a constant. However, in ERGO, an operand can also be a path expression. For the purpose of this discussion, a path expression of the form \( p.q \) should be understood as a shortcut for \( p[\text{q -> ?X}] \), where \(?X\) is a new variable, and \( p.q.r \) is a shortcut for \( p[\text{q -> ?X}], \ ?X[\text{r -> ?Y}] \), where \(?X\) and \(?Y\) are new variables. More detailed discussion of path expressions appears in Section 8.

In arithmetic expressions, all variables are considered to be existentially quantified. For example, the following query

\[
\text{ergo> John.bonus + Mary.bonus > 1000.}
\]

should be understood as

\[
\text{ergo> John[bonus -> ?_V1], Mary[bonus -> ?_V2], ?_V1+?_V2 > 1000.}
\]

Note that the first query does not have any variables, so after the evaluation the system would print either yes or no. To achieve the same behavior, we use don't care variables, \(?_V1\) and \(?_V2\). If we used \(?V1\) and \(?V2\) instead, the values of these variables would have been printed out.

ERGO recognizes numbers as oids and, thus, it is perfectly normal to have arithmetic expressions inside path expressions such as this: \(1.2.(3+4*2).7\). When parentheses are omitted, this might lead to ambiguity. For instance, does the expression \(1.m+2.n.k\) correspond to the arithmetic expression \((1.m)+(2.n.k)\), to the path expressions \((1.m+2.n).k\), by \((1.m + 2).n.k\), or to \(1.(m+2).n.k\)? To disambiguate such expressions, we must remember that the operator “." used in path expressions binds stronger than the arithmetic operators +, −, etc.

Even more interesting is the following example: \(2.3.4\). Does it represent the path expression \((2).(3).(4)\), or \((2.3).4\), or \(2.(3.4)\) (where in the latter two cases 2.3 and 3.4 are interpreted as decimal numbers)? The answer to this puzzle (according to ERGO conventions) is \((2.3).4\): when tokenizing, ERGO first tries to classify tokens into meaningful categories. Thus, when 2.3 is first found, it is identified as a decimal. Thus, the parser receives the expression \((2.3).4\), which it identifies as a path expression that consists of two components, the oids 2.3 and 4.

Another ambiguous situation arises when the symbols − and + are used as minus and plus signs, respectively. ERGO follows the common arithmetic interpretation of such expressions, where the
### Table 3: Operators in increasing precedence order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precedence</th>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Associativity</th>
<th>Arity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>parentheses; used to change precedence</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>object reference</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>: ::</td>
<td>class membership and subclass relationships</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>minus sign</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>unary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>plus sign</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>unary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>multiplication</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>power</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>division</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>- +</td>
<td>subtraction and addition</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>=&lt;</td>
<td>less than or equals to</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>=&gt;</td>
<td>greater than or equals to</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>=:=</td>
<td>numeric equals-to</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>==</td>
<td>unequal to</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>\is</td>
<td>arithmetic assignment</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>unification</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>!= or =</td>
<td>disunification</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>==</td>
<td>identity</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>=..</td>
<td>meta decomposition</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>\naf</td>
<td>well-founded negation</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>unary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250</td>
<td>\neg</td>
<td>explicit negation</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>unary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Prolog-style negation</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>unary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>990</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>semantic unification</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>990</td>
<td>! ~ or ~</td>
<td>semantic disunification</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>string/term concatenation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>++ - - &amp; &amp;</td>
<td>list append/set union/difference/intersection</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>binary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+/- signs bind stronger than the infix operators and thus 4-7 and 4+-7 are interpreted as 4-(-7) and 4-(-7), respectively.

Table 3 lists various operators in decreasing precedence order, their associativity, and arity. When in doubt, use parentheses. Here are some more examples of valid arithmetic expressions:

1. `o1.m1+o2.m2.m3` same as `(o1.m1)+(o2.m2)`
2. `2.(3.4)` the value of the attribute 3.4 on object 2
3. `3 + - - 2` same as `3+(-(-2))`
4. `5 * - 6` same as `5*(-6)`
5. `5.(-6)` the value of the attribute -6 on object 5

Note that the parentheses in `5.(-6)` are needed, because otherwise “.-’’ would be recognized
as a single token. Similarly, the whitespace around “+”, “-”, and “*” are also needed in these examples to avoid ‘-’ and ‘+’ being interpreted as distinct tokens.

In ERGO, `\is/2` also understands the string concatenation operator, `||`, and the list append, difference, and intersect operators `++`, `--`, and `&&`. For instance,

```erlang
?- ?X \is abc || 'cde: ' || f(?P) || ';', writeln(?X)\io.
abccd: f(?A) ;
```

Note that this operator converts terms into their printable representation and tries to give meaningful names to variables.

Examples of list append/difference/intersection include:

```erlang
?- ?X \is (([a,c,?L,b]--[c])++[?L,1]) -- [?L,a].
Result: ?X = [b, 1]

?- ?X \is [a,c,?L,b]--[c]++[?L,1].
Result: ?X = [a, b]

?- ?X \is [a,b]++[c]++[?L,1].
Result: ?X = [a, b, c, _h9660, 1]

?- ?X \is [a,b]++[c]++[p,1]&&[b,c,p].
Result: ?X = [a, b, c, p]
```

To understand the results of these queries, the reader needs to keep in mind that `++`, `--`, and `&&` are right-associative operators. In the first example, we explicitly placed the parentheses to change the order of the operations, but in the last three examples parenthesizing happens implicitly, through right-association. For example, in the second case we really have `[a,c,?L,b]--([c]++[?L,1])`. The other important thing to note is that variables are not unified, but are compared via lexical identity. This is why, in the second query, `?L` disappears from the result, but if the list expression were `[a,c,?L,b]--([c]++[?K,1])` then the result of the evaluation would be `[a,?L,b]`. 
In addition to the operators, the builtin function, and constants listed in Table 4 can occur in arithmetic expressions, i.e., on the right side of \( \texttt{is}/2 \) and on either side of the inequalities \((>, <, =<, \text{ and } >=)\).

Note: the expression on the right side of \( \texttt{is}/2 \) must not contain any variables at the time the \( \texttt{is}/2 \) predicate is evaluated (except in case of the \( || \) operator illustrated above). Otherwise, an error is issued. If you want to solve equations and constraints (e.g., find \( X \) such that \( 5 = ?X + 2 \)), \( \texttt{is}/2 \) is a wrong predicate to do so: see Section 32 for the proper way to do this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Arity</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>min, max</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>minimum and maximum of the arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>absolute value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ceiling, floor, round</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ceiling, floor, and rounding of a real</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>float</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>convert to float</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>truncate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>truncate the decimal part of a real</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mod</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>integer division modulo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rem</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>remainder of integer division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>div, %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>integer division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exp, **</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>exponent of argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>exponent of number E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sqrt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>square root</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sign</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>sign of number (1 or -1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sin, cos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>sine and cosine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asin, acos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>arcsine and arccosine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan, atan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>tangent and arctangent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>logarithm base ( E )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>logarithm base ( 10 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∧, ∨</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>bit-wise AND and bit-wise OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( e, \pi  )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>the ( E ) and PI numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min, max, sum, avg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>take a list of numbers; return min, max, sum, and average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>count, last</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>take a list; return the number of members and the last member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>take a number, ( N ), and a list; return the ( N )-th element of the list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delete</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>delete element (arg1) from list (arg2); return the resulting list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reverse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>reverse list</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Arithmetic functions that can be used in arithmetic expressions

Also, in the arithmetic expressions on the right side of \( \texttt{is}/2 \), both \( \texttt{pi}, \texttt{e}, \texttt{\pi}, \text{ and } \texttt{\e} \) are recognized. However, outside of the context of \( \texttt{is}/2 \), only \( \texttt{\pi} \) and \( \texttt{\e} \) are recognized as special constants. The other functions in the above table (like \( \texttt{min, max, trigonometry} \)) are recognized both in \( \texttt{is}/2 \) expressions and inside constraints (see Section 32). Yet others (\( \texttt{div, rem, mod} \)) are recognized only inside \( \texttt{is}/2 \) expressions.

\( \texttt{\textsc{ergo}} \) also supplies additional functions that can be used with \( \texttt{is} \), including \( \texttt{sum, min, max, avg, last, count, delete, reverse, and nth} \). For instance,

\[- \texttt{?X \ is count([a,b,c])}. \quad \text{// } \texttt{?X = 3} \]
?\(- \ ?X \ \text{\texttt{\textbackslash is} avg([1,2,3])}. \quad \text{//} \ ?X = 2
?\(- \ ?X \ \text{\texttt{\textbackslash is} sum([1,2,3])}. \quad \text{//} \ ?X = 6
?\(- \ ?X \ \text{\texttt{\textbackslash is} nth(2,[a,b,c])}. \quad \text{//} \ ?X = b

**Inline evaluation of arithmetic expressions.** In addition to the various extensions of \texttt{\textbackslash is}/2, \texttt{\textsc{Ergo}} provides a more natural and powerful way to evaluate expressions by placing them directly as arguments of the predicates and frames, and prefixing them with a “\texttt{=}” or with “\texttt{\textbackslash is}”. This can be done both in rule heads and rule bodies. For example,

```
q(2).
p(=?X+3) :- q(?X). \quad \text{// alternatively:} \ p(\texttt{\textbackslash is} ?X+3) :- q(?X).
?- p(?X).

?X = 5
```

Note that if we used the rule \texttt{p(?X+3) :- q(?X)} instead (i.e., without the prefix “\texttt{=}” or “\texttt{\textbackslash is}”) then the answer to the above query would have been \texttt{?X = 2+3} because arithmetic expressions are not evaluated by default.

The following example illustrates the inline evaluation feature in a query (it works identically in rule bodies):

```
q(2), p(5).
?- q(?X), p(=?X+3). \quad \text{// alternatively:} \ ?- q(?X), p(\texttt{\textbackslash is} ?X+3).

Yes
```

Perhaps the most interesting way to use this feature is in combination with the string concatenation operator introduced earlier. This combination provides Java-like printing facility as follows:

```
p(a,b).

?- p(?X,?Y), writeln(= result ||': '|| ?X|| + || ?Y)@io.

result: a+b
```
Observe that all arithmetic functions, as well as list/string concatenation, list operations, etc., are allowed in inline expressions. For instance,

\[
p(\sin(5)+\arctan(3)).
\]

?- p(?X).

Result: ?X = 0.2901

\[
q(a,b), \ r([1,2,3],[1,3],[3,8]).
\]

p(?X)?Y, \is \ ?Z++?V-?W) :- q(?X,?Y), r(?Z,?V,?W).

?- p(ab,[1,2,3,1]).

Yes

Note: Aggregate operators described in Section 30 and user-defined functions (UDFs) described in Section 25 are always evaluated when they are found in an argument position, so they never need to be prefixed with an “=” or an \is. For instance,

\[
\text{\texttt{\textbackslash udf}\ f(?X) := =?X+5 } \it{if } p(?X). \\
p\{1,2,3\}. \\
?- \text{\textbackslash insert}\{q(6)\}. \\
?- \text{\textbackslash insert}\{r(=f(?X))\}. \quad \text{UDF } f/1 \text{ used inline without a } = \\
?- \text{\textbackslash q}\{\text{\texttt{\textbackslash sum}}(?V|p(?V))\}. \quad \text{Yes. Aggr } \text{\texttt{\textbackslash sum}}(?V|p(?V)) \text{ used inline without a } = \\
?- \text{\textbackslash r(?Z)}. \quad \text{?X = 6,7,8}
\]

7.6 Quasi-constants and Quasi-variables

In some cases the developer might require the knowledge base to refer to the information about the source code where the various ErGO statements occur. To this end, the compiler provides a number of quasi-constants, which get substituted for real constants at compile or a loading time. The supported constants are:

- \#\#1, \#\#2, etc. – Skolem constants.
- \#! – the Id of the rule where this quasi-constant occurs.
• \@ – the module into which the file containing this quasi-constant is loaded. In the ERGO shell, this quasi-constant is set to be the symbol `main`.

• \@F – the file in which this quasi-constant occurs. In the ERGO shell, this quasi-constant is set to be the symbol `(runtime)`.

• \@L – the line in the source code on which this quasi-constant occurs.

• \@? – the quasi-constant that represents the null value. The null value quasi-constant has the special property that \@? = \@? and \@? ::= \@?, but not \@? == \@?. It is convenient to use \@? as a default value for various properties inherited from classes. This quasi-constant is also used in various interfaces to external sources, such as the database interface, JSON, and tabular data (CSV, DSV, etc.).

Some of these constants are further illustrated in later in this manual. A typical use of these constants is to put them somewhere in place of a constant or a variable. For instance,

\[
p(\@F,?X,?Y) :- ?X = \@L, ?Y = \@!.
\]

In addition, ERGO provides a number of quasi-variables. Quasi-variables are similar to quasi-constants in that ERGO replaces them by constants. However, this happens at run time, during the evaluation. The supported quasi-variables are:

• \?C – the module from which the given rule was called. Used in the bodies of rules and queries.

• \?F – the file name from which a sensor was called. Used only in the bodies of the rules that are part of a sensor definition.

• \?L – the line number from which a sensor was called. Used only in the bodies of the rules that are part of a sensor definition.

### 7.7 Synonyms

For better readability by non-experts and for documentation purposes, ERGO provides the following useful mnemonic keywords, which can be used in place of the most commonly used symbols:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Synonym</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>isa, memberof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>::</td>
<td>sub, subclassof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=&gt;</td>
<td>hasValue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>contains</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.8 Reserved Symbols

ERGO reserves all symbols that begin with the backslash, such as \or, \hastype, \io, \neg, etc. In addition, the symbols \-, \=, \==, \=-, \=-, \=-, \=-, \=, \?-?, \?, \#, \"\"\"\", \"\"\"\", \="\", \="\", \="\", arithmetic operators, \/, and \ are also reserved and cannot be used as names of methods, function symbols, predicates, and the like.

8 Path Expressions

In addition to the basic F-logic syntax, the ERGO system also supports path expressions to simplify object navigation along value-returning method applications, and to avoid explicit join conditions [6]. The basic idea is to allow the following path expressions wherever Id-terms are allowed:

7. \O.M

The path expression in (7) refers to an object \R_0 for which \O[M->\R_0] holds. The symbols \O and \M stand for an Id-term or a path expression. As a special case, \M can be a method that takes arguments. For instance, \O.M(P_1,\ldots,P_k) is a valid path expression.

Path expressions associate to the left, so \a.b.c is equivalent to (\a.b).c, which specifies the object o such that \a[b->x] ∧ x[c->o] holds (note that x = a.b). To change that, parentheses can be used. For instance, \a.(b.c) is that object o1 for which b[c->x1] ∧ a[x1->o1] holds (note that in this case, x1 = b.c). In general, o and o1 can be different objects. Note also that in (\a.b).c, b is a method name, whereas in \a.(b.c) it is used as an object name and b.c as a method. Observe that function symbols can also be applied to path expressions, since path expressions, like Id-terms, represent objects. Thus, \f(\a.b) is a valid expression.

Note: Since a path expression represents an object Id, it can appear wherever an oid can, and it cannot appear in place of a truth-valued expression (e.g., a subquery). Thus,

?- \?P.authors.

is illegal. To use a path expression as a query, square brackets must be attached. For instance, the following are legal queries:

?- \?P.authors[].
?- \?P.authors[name->?N].

As path expressions and frames can be arbitrarily nested, this leads to a concise and flexible specification language for object properties, as illustrated in the following example.
Example 8.1 (Path Expressions) Consider again the schema given in Figure 1. If \( n \) represents the name of a person, the following path expression is a query that returns all editors of conferences in which \( n \) had a paper:

\[
?- \ P[\text{authors} -> ?[\text{name} -> ?n]].\text{at_conf}.\text{editors}[].
\]

Likewise, the answer to the query

\[
?- \ P[\text{authors} -> ?[\text{name} -> ?n]].\text{at_conf}[[\text{editors} -> ?E]].
\]

is the set of all pairs \((P,E)\) such that \( P \) is (the logical oid of) a paper written by \( n \), and \( E \) is the corresponding proceedings editor. If we also want to see the affiliations of the above editors, we only need to modify our query slightly:

\[
?- \ P[\text{authors} -> ?[\text{name} -> ?n]].\text{at_conf}[[\text{year} -> ?Y]].\text{editors}[\text{affil(?Y) -> ?A}].
\]

Thus, EROGO path expressions support navigation along the method application dimension using the operator “.”. In addition, intermediate objects through which such navigation takes place can be selected by specifying the properties of such objects inside square brackets.\(^5\)

To access intermediate objects that arise implicitly in the middle of a path expression, one can define the method self as

\[
?X[\text{self} -> ?X].
\]

and then simply write \( \ldots[\text{self} -> ?O]\ldots \) anywhere in a complex path expression. This would bind the Id of the current object to the variable \( ?O \).

Example 8.2 (Path Expressions with self) To illustrate the convenience afforded by the use of the self attribute in path expressions, consider the second query in Example 8.1. If, in addition, we want to obtain the names of the conferences where the respective papers were published, that query can be reformulated as follows:

\[
?X[\text{self} -> ?X].
\]

\[
?- \ P[\text{authors} -> ?[\text{name} -> ?n]].\text{at_conf}[\text{self} -> ?C, \text{year} -> ?Y].\text{editors}[\text{affil(?Y) -> ?A}].
\]

\(^5\) A similar feature is used in other languages, e.g., XSQL [8].
9  Set Notation

The original F-logic [9] permitted convenient set notation as return values of set-valued methods. For instance,

\[ \text{John[children->\{Mary, Bob\}] \} \]

is a shortcut for the conjunction

\[ \text{John[children->Mary], John[children->Bob]} \]

whether this expression occurs in the head or the body of a rule. ERGO makes a leap forward in this direction and permits set notation anywhere a path expression is allowed. Here are some examples of what is possible:

\[
\{\text{Mary, Joe}\} : \{\text{Student, Worker}\}.
\]

\[
\]

\[
\text{child(John, \{Mary, Kate, Bob\}).}
\]

The above statements are, respectively, shortcuts for

\[
\text{Mary:Student, Mary:Student, Joe:Student, Joe:Worker.}
\]

\[
\text{happily_married(?X, ?Y) :- person(?X), person(?Y),}
\]

\[
\text{?X[spouse->?Y], ?X[loves->?Y].}
\]

\[
\text{child(John, Mary), child(John, Kate), child(John, Bob).}
\]

For some more extreme examples, consider these:

\[
\{p, q\}(a, g(f(\{b, c\}))).
\]

\[
\text{r(?X, ?Y) := \{p, q\}(?, ?(f(?X, ?Y))).}
\]

\[
\{a, m\}[(\text{prop1, prop2} \rightarrow \{1, \{2,3\}, 4\}].
\]

These are shortcuts for the following statements, respectively:

\[
\text{p(a, g(f(b))), p(a, g(f(c))), q(a, g(f(b))), q(a, g(f(c))).}
\]

\[
\text{r(?X), r(?Y) := p(?), ?(f(?X))), p(?), ?(f(?Y))), q(?), ?(f(?X))), q(?), ?(f(?Y))).}
\]

\[
\text{a[prop1->\{1,2,3,4\}, prop2->\{1,2,3,4\}], m[prop1->\{1,2,3,4\}, prop2->\{1,2,3,4\}}.}
\]

The set term \(\{1, \{2,3\}, 4\}\) above is just a less readable way of writing \(\{1,2,3,4\}\), by the way—the there are no true set-objects in ERGO or F-logic. Other extremely useful cases of the use of the set notation involve equality and related operators. For instance,
10 Typed Variables

Apart from the regular variables, ERGO supports typed variables. Typed variables can be bound to classes, which will restrict them so that they will be unifiable only with members of the specified classes. This includes the classes associated with all the primitive data types such as \`\texttt{\textbackslash integer}, \texttt{\textbackslash real}, \texttt{\textbackslash time}, \texttt{\textbackslash list}, \texttt{\textbackslash duration}, etc., which are discussed in Section 41. The syntax is \texttt{?Var\textasciicircum\textasciicircum\textbackslash Class}. The class can be a class name (which may have variables) or a class expression. For instance,

\begin{verbatim}
father(?X\textasciicircum\textbackslash integer,?Y\textasciicircum\textbackslash Person) :- parent(?X,?Y), male(?X).
grandfather(?X\textasciicircum\textbackslash integer,?Y\textasciicircum\textbackslash Person) :- father(?X,?Z\textasciicircum\textbackslash Person),parent(Z,Y).
?- foo(?Y\textasciicircum(A,(B-C) ; \textbackslash dateTyme).
\end{verbatim}

As seen from the example, the type declaration can appear both in the head and the body of a rule. The semantics is that once the variable is bound then the binding is checked for belonging to the specified class. Theoretically this is equivalent to making a test like \texttt{?X:Class} but in practice typed variables can be much more efficient. Testing \texttt{?X:Class} means enumerating the entire class \texttt{Class}, which can be expensive when the class is large and may not terminate, if the class is infinite (e.g., \texttt{?X:\textbackslash integer}).

The \texttt{?Var\textasciicircum\textbackslash Class} should be understood as a declaration, so it should be done only once per variable in the same rule. Multiple declarations are treated as intersections. For instance,

\begin{verbatim}
?- ?X\textasciicircum\textasciicircum\textbackslash foo=?, ?X\textasciicircum\textasciicircum\textbackslash moo=?.

?X = ?_h6272 { \$typed variable : type = (moo , foo) }
?- ?X\textasciicircum\textasciicircum\textbackslash foo=\textbackslash moo.

?X = ?_h5593 { \$typed variable : type = (moo , foo) }
?Y = ?_h5593 { \$typed variable : type = (moo , foo) }
\end{verbatim}
Here are some additional examples:

\[ \{1,2\}:\text{foo}, \{2,3\}:\text{moo}. \quad // \text{facts} \]

?- \text{foo} = 4. \quad // \text{false} 
?- \text{foo} = 1 \quad // \text{true} 
?- \text{X} = \text{foo} = \text{moo}, \text{X} = 3 \quad // \text{false} 
?- \text{X} = \text{foo} = \text{moo}, \text{X} = 2 \quad // \text{true} 
?- \text{X} = \text{foo} = \text{moo} = 2 \quad // \text{false} 
?- \text{X} = \text{foo} = \text{moo} = 1 \quad // \text{true} 
?- \text{X} = \text{foo} = \text{moo} = 2 \quad // \text{false} 
?- \text{X} = \text{foo} = \text{moo} = 3 \quad // \text{true} 
?- \{1,2,-3\}:\{\text{integer}, \text{short}, \text{long}\}, \quad // \text{true} 
\{1,2,3,4\}:\{\text{real}, \text{float}, \text{double}\}, 
[\text{a,3}] = \text{X} = \text{list}, 
?X:\text{list}, 
"\text{abc}" = \text{\charlist}, 
?Y:\text{charlist}, 
\text{writeln(test6=ok)@pg.} 

11 Truth Values and Object Values

Id-terms, terms and path expressions can be also understood as objects. This is clear for Id-terms. The object interpretation for path expressions of the form (7) was given on page 31. On the other hand, frame formulas, class membership, and subclassing are typically understood as truth-valued formulas. However, there also is a natural way to interpret them as objects. For example, \( o : c \left[ m \rightarrow r \right] \) has object value \( o \) and some truth value. However, unlike the object value, the truth value depends on the database (on whether \( o \) belongs to class \( c \) in the database and whether the value of the attribute \( m \) is, indeed, \( r \)).

Although previously we discussed only the object interpretation for path expressions, it is easy to see that they have truth values as well, because a path expression corresponds to a conjunction of F-logic frames. Consequently, all frame literals of the form (1) through (7) have dual readings: As logical formulas (the deductive perspective), and as expressions that represent one or more objects (the object-oriented perspective). Given an intended model, \( I \), of an F-logic knowledge base, an expression has:

- An object value, which yields the Id(s) of the object(s) that are reachable in \( I \) by the corresponding expression, and
• A truth value, like any other literal of the language.

An important property that relates the above interpretations is: a frame, r, evaluates to false if \( I \) has no object corresponding to r.

Consider the following path expression and an equivalent, decomposed expression:

\[
\text{a.b[c\rightarrow d.e]} \iff \text{a[b\rightarrow ?x_{ab}] \land d[e\rightarrow ?x_{de}] \land ?x_{ab}[c\rightarrow ?x_{de}].}
\]  

Such decomposition is used to determine the truth value of arbitrarily complex path expressions in the body of a rule. Let \( \text{obj(path)} \) denote the Ids of all objects represented by the path expression. Then, for (2) above, we have:

\[
\text{obj(d.e)} = \{x_{de} | I| = d[e\rightarrow x_{de}]\}
\]

where \( I| = \varphi \) means that \( \varphi \) holds in \( I \). Observe two formulas can be equivalent, but their object values might be different. For instance, \( d[e\rightarrow f] \) is equivalent to \( d.e \) as a formula. However, \( \text{obj(d.e)} \) is \( f \), while \( \text{obj(d[e\rightarrow f])} \) is \( d \).

In general, for an F-logic database \( I \), the object values of ground path expressions are given by the following mapping, \( \text{obj} \), from ground frame literals to sets of ground oids (\( t, o, c, d, m \) can be oids or path expressions):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{obj}(t) & := \{ t | I| = t[] \}, \text{ for a ground Id-term } t \\
\text{obj}(o[...]) & := \{ o1 | o1 \in \text{obj}(o), I| = o1[...]\} \\
\text{obj}(o:c) & := \{ o1 | o1 \in \text{obj}(o), I| = o1:c\} \\
\text{obj}(c::d) & := \{ c1 | c1 \in \text{obj}(c), I| = c1::d\} \\
\text{obj}(o.m) & := \{ r1 | r1 \in \text{obj}(r), I| = o[m\rightarrow r]\}
\end{align*}
\]

Observe that if \( t[...] \) does not occur in \( I \), then \( \text{obj}(t) \) is \( \emptyset \). Conversely, a ground frame \( r \) is called active if \( \text{obj}(r) \) is not empty.

**Meta-predicates.** Since path expressions can appear wherever Id-terms are allowed, the question arises whether a path expression is intended to indicate a truth value or an object value. For instance, we may want to call a predicate \text{foobar}/1, which expects as an argument a formula because the predicate calls this formula as part of its definition. For instance, the predicate may take a formula and a variable that occurs in that formula and joins this formula with some predicate using that variable:

\[
\text{foobar(?Form,?Var)} :- \text{?Form, mypred(?Var).} \\
?- \text{foobar($a[b\rightarrow ?X], \ ?X).}
\]
Here $a[b->?X]$ is a reification of the formula $a[b->?X]$ (see Section 18.2), i.e., an object that represents the formula. ERGO does not allow one to write $foobar(a[b->?X],?X)$ because this notation proved to be error-prone and confusing to the user in the previous versions of the system.

12 Boolean Methods

As a syntactic sugar, ERGO provides boolean methods, which can be considered as value-returning methods that return some fixed value, e.g., void. For example, the following facts:

John[is_tall -> void].
John[loves(tennis) -> void].

can be simplified as boolean methods as follows:

John[is_tall].
John[loves(tennis)].

Conceptually, boolean methods are statements about objects whose truth value is the only concern. Boolean methods do not return any value (not even the value void). Therefore, boolean methods cannot appear in path expressions. For instance, John.is_vegetarian, where is_vegetarian is a binary method, is illegal.

Like other methods, boolean methods can be inherited, if specified as part of the class information:

Buddhist[|is_vegetarian|].
John:Buddhist.

The above says that all Buddhists are vegetarian by default and John (the object with oid John) is a Buddhist. Since is_vegetarian is specified as a property of the entire class Buddhist, it follows that John is also a vegetarian, i.e., John[is_vegetarian].

12.1 Boolean Signatures

Boolean methods can have signatures like the value-returning methods. These signatures can be specified as part of the object-level information (in which case they apply to specific objects) or as part of the class information (in which case they apply to all objects in the class and to all subclasses):
Obj[=>Meth]
Class[|=>Meth|]

The first statement refers to Class as an individual object, while the second is a statement about the type of the object Class as a class. It thus is inherited by every member of Class and all its subclasses. For instance,

\[\text{Person}[]\rightarrow \text{loves}(\text{game})[]\].

## 13 Skolem Symbols

For applications where the particular names for oids are not important, ERGO provides the quasi-constants \# and \#1, \#2, etc., to automatically generate a new Skolem constant or a Skolem function symbol to test for such automatically generated constants. We call such symbols Skolem symbols. Skolem symbols are interpreted differently in the rule heads and bodies.

**Skolems in rule heads and descriptors outside of the reification operator.** Outside of reification (see Section 18.2 for the details of reification), the head-occurrences of Skolem symbols are interpreted, as described below.

Each occurrence of \# in the rule head or a rule descriptor (see Section 36 to learn about rule descriptors) represents a new Skolem constant, which is unique throughout the source code.

Uniqueness is achieved through the use of a special “weird” naming schema for such oids, which internally prefixes them with several "_$"s. However, as long as the user does not use a similar naming convention (who, on earth, would give names that begin with lots of "_$"s?), uniqueness is guaranteed.

For example, in the following example

\[#\{\text{ssn}\rightarrow 123, \text{father}\rightarrow \#, \text{spouse}\rightarrow \#, \text{name}\rightarrow \text{John}, \text{spouse}\rightarrow \#, \text{name}\rightarrow \text{Mary}\}\].
\text{foo}\{\#(\text{?X})\rightarrow \text{?Y}\} :- \text{bar}\{\text{?Y}\rightarrow \text{?X}\}.

the compiler will generate unique oids for each occurrence of \#. Note that, in the second clause, only one oid is generated and it serves as a method name.

**Co-reference of Skolem symbols.** In some situations, it is necessary to be able to create a new oid and use it within the same rule head or a fact multiple times. Sometimes the same Skolem might need to be used across several different rules and facts. Since such an oid needs to be referenced
inside the same clause, it is no longer possible to use $\#$, because each occurrence of $\#$ causes the compiler to generate a new Skolem symbol. To solve this problem, ERGO allows **numbered Skolem symbols** as well as **named Skolem symbols**, which are of the form $\#_{132}$, or $\#_{abc}$ i.e., $\#$ with a number or an alphanumeric symbol attached to it. For instance,

```prolog
\#1[ssn->123,father->f(\#1)[name->John,spouse->\#[name->Mary,knows->\#foobar2]]].
\#foobar2[self->\#foobar2,child->\#1].
```

The first time the compiler finds $\#1$ in the first clause above, it will generate a new Skolem constant for an oid. However, the second occurrence of $\#1$ in the same clause (in $f(\#1)$) will use the oid previously generated for the first occurrence. Similarly, the two occurrences of $\#_{foobar2}$ in the second clause refer to the same new constant. On the other hand, occurrences of $\#1$ and $\#_{foobar2}$ in different clauses stand for different oids. Thus, the occurrences of $\#1$ (and of $\#_{foobar2}$) in the first and second clauses above refer to different objects.

The same numbered or named Skolem can be co-referenced in different facts and rules. The general rule is that the scope of a numbered Skolem is a ERGO sentence terminated with a period. For instance, in the following

```prolog
(h1(?X,\#1) :- b1(?X),c1(?X)).
p(a,\#1),
q(b(\#1)),
(h2(?X,\#1,?Y) :- b2(?X,?Y)).
```

the four occurrences of $\#1$ represent the same Skolem constant. Note that the first and the last statement above are rules, while the two middle statements are facts. The reason why all occurrences of $\#1$ are the same is because all four statements are within the same scope: all four are terminated by the same period. Note also that each rule must be enclosed in parentheses or else ambiguity arises. For instance,

```prolog
h1(?X,\#1) :- b1(?X),c1(?X),
p(a,\#1),
q(b(\#1)).
```

would be interpreted as a single rule whose body has four literals, not as a statement that contains a rule $h1(?X,\#1) :- b1(?X),c1(?X)$ and two additional, separate facts. Also note that it is not necessary to put each of the four sub-statement above on a separate line—this was done for readability.

**Controlling the scope of co-reference of Skolem symbols.** In some advanced cases, the scoping of named and numbered Skolems provided by default might be too limiting because it may
be too difficult, inconvenient, or impossible to thrust all the necessary clauses in one dot-terminated
group. To overcome this difficulty, ERGO provides global Skolems, which are always numbered or
named and the scope of the name is controlled by the programmer explicitly.

Global Skolems name the form \##Number or \##Name, where Number is an integer and Name
is an alphanumerical symbol. For instance, in our earlier example,

\##1[ssn->123,father->f(\##1)[name->John,spouse->\#[name->Mary,knows->\##foobar2]]].
\##foobar2[self->\##foobar2,child->\##1].

all occurrences of \##1 refer to the same new constant and all occurrences of \##foobar2 refer to
the same new constant (but different from the one for \##1).

The scope of co-reference for global Skolems will persist until it is changed explicitly with the
compile-time directive

      :- new_global_oid_scope.

To use this effectively, one must understand when these directives take effect. The following example
may help clarify this. Suppose we load a file with the following contents

      p(\##abc).   // statement 1
      :- new_global_oid_scope. // statement 2
      p(\##abc).   // statement 3
      ?- insert{p(\##abc)}. // statement 4
      :- new_global_oid_scope. // statement 5
      ?- insert{p(\##abc)}. // statement 6
      p(\##abc).   // statement 7
      p(\##abc).   // statement 8
      ?- insert{p(\##abc)}. // statement 9

If we now ask the query

      ?- p(?X).

we will get these three distinct answers (up to a renaming of the Skolem constants):

      ?X = \##abc (\$_$\_ergo‘autogen1|abc’2)
      ?X = \##abc (\$_$\_ergo‘autogen2|abc’2)
      ?X = \##abc (\$_$\_ergo‘autogen3|abc’2)
Why only three answers? At compile time, \texttt{##abc} in statements 1, 3, 6 will be replaced with three different Skolems because of the two intervening compile time directives \texttt{new\_global\_oid\_scope}. Statements 4 and 7–9 will generate no new oids and therefore will produce duplicate facts, which will be discarded. (The occurrence of \texttt{##abc} in statement 4 will be replaced with the same constant as in statement 3 and the occurrences in statements 7–9 will be replaced with the same constant as in statement 6).

In some very rare cases, one might need to employ the runtime version of the \texttt{new\_global\_oid\_scope} directive:

\begin{verbatim}
?- new\_global\_oid\_scope.
\end{verbatim}

This may be needed, for instance, to ensure that two different files share no global Skolems. Such an effect can be achieved by executing the above runtime directive before compiling the second file.

**Generating Skolems at run time.** Normally, Skolem constants are generated at compile time without regard for the oids that might exist at run time. Sometimes it is necessary to generate a Skolem constant at run time. This can be accomplished with the \texttt{skolem\{...\}} built-in. For instance,

\begin{verbatim}
ergo> skolem(?X).
?X = _$$_ergo’dyn\_skolem308 (#)
1 solution(s) in 0.0000 seconds
Yes
ergo> skolem(?X).
?X = _$$_ergo’dyn\_skolem309 (#)
\end{verbatim}

etc.

**Skolems in subgoals of rule bodies outside of the reification operator.** In a body subgoal outside of the reification operator, a Skolem symbol (numbered/named or not) is interpreted differently that in the head: not as a new Skolem constant, but as a test of whether or not the corresponding argument is bound to a Skolem constant. One can think of it as a variable that is tested for being bound to a Skolem constant. Numbered Skolems within the same rule are interpreted as
the same variable, so the occurrences of the same numbered or named Skolem are expected to be bound to the same constant. For instance, in

?- insert{abc[prop1->\#, prop2->\#3, prop3->\#3],
cde[prop1->\#, prop2->\#3, prop3->\#]}.  
  test1 :- abc[prop1->\#, prop2->\#abc, prop3->\#abc].  
  test2 :- cde[prop1->\#, prop2->\#5, prop3->\#5].

Here the query test1 will return true because in the object abc the properties prop1 and prop2 are bound to the same Skolem constant. In contrast, in cde, these properties are not bound to the same Skolem (since \#3 and \# are different Skolems), so the query test2 fails.

Note that, as a test, both \# and \#N, where N is an positive integer, match not only Skolem constants, but also Skolem functions. For instance, the query

?- insert{p(\#(a,b))}, p(\#).

succeeds because \#(a,b) is a term obtained from an application of a Skolem function, \#, to its arguments.

Note that, since Skolems have a different semantics in the rule head and in the body, the following, somewhat counter-intuitive situation might occur:

p(\#1) :- q(\#1).

Here \#1 inside p(...) is a constant, while in inside q(...) it is a check that the argument of q/1 is bound to a Skolem term.

Skolems in reified rules. If a reified rule, \$R, occurs somewhere in the body or a head of another, normal rule (or fact), the Skolem symbols that occur in \$R are interpreted the same way as if the rule were outside of reification. That is, the head occurrences in \$R are interpreted as Skolem constants and the body occurrences are interpreted as tests for Skolems. For instance, in

head1({head11(?X,\#) :- body11(\#1,\#1)}).
head2 :- body2({head22(?X,\#) :- body22(\#1,\#1)}).

the symbol \# in the fact head11(...) is a Skolem constant, while the two occurrences of the symbol \#1 in body11 test if body11(?X,?Y) can succeed with ?X and ?Y bound to the same Skolem constant. The interpretation of \# and \#1 in the second rule above is similar.
**Skolems in reified subgoals.** If a reified subgoal (not rule), $G$, contains a Skolem symbol, that symbol is interpreted as a Skolem constant. This is true both if $G$ occurs in the head of a rule or in the body. Note that this implies that if one later uses $G$ as a query then this query is likely to fail. For instance, in

$$?- \text{insert}(p(a), p(\#)).$$
$$?- ?X = \{p(\#)\}, ?X.$$ 

the second query will fail because the occurrence of $\#$ there is a Skolem constant that differs from the Skolem constant in the first rule. However,

$$?- ?X = \{p(\#)\}, \text{insert}(?X), p(\#).$$

succeeds because when the reified subgoal $\{p(\#)\}$ is inserted into the database, the Skolem symbol is interpreted as a constant and the subsequent check $p(\#)$ tests that the argument of $p$ is bound to a Skolem constant.

Numbered/named Skolems are interpreted the same way as non-numbered/unnamed ones except that different occurrences of the same numbered/named Skolem symbol are treated as identical within the same rule or query. For instance, below,

$$?- ?X = \{p(\#2, \#2)\}, \text{insert}(?X), p(\#7, \#7).$$
$$?- \text{erase}(p(?,:), ?X = \{p(\#2, \#)\}, \text{insert}(?X), p(\#7, \#7).$$

the first query succeeds, while the second fails.

**More on Skolems.** A Skolem constant can also be used as a function symbol and even a predicate symbol. For instance, $\#(a,b)$. Since $\mathcal{E}\mathcal{R}\mathcal{G}O$ terms are actually HiLog terms, we can also have higher-order Skolem functions, as in these terms:

$$\#1(\text{foo}, \text{bar})(123)$$
$$\#(a, c, d)(o, w)(1, 2)$$

Sometimes it is useful to know whether a particular term is a Skolem term, i.e., whether it is a Skolem constant or is constructed using a Skolem function or a higher-order Skolem function. To this end, $\mathcal{E}\mathcal{R}\mathcal{G}O$ provides a special built-in class, $\text{skolem}$. For instance, in the following case

$$p(\#1(\text{foo}, \text{bar})(123)).$$
$$?- p(?X), ?X: \text{skolem}. $$
the variable \( ?X \) gets bound to a higher-order Skolem term, so the query succeeds. But the query \( ?- f(a):\text{skolem} \) fails, since \( f \) is not a Skolem symbol. In addition to this, EREGO provides a builtin for checking if a particular symbol (symbol, not just any term) is Skolem. For instance,

\[
?\text{- skolem} {?X}, \text{isskolem} {?X}
\]

will succeed. Of course, \( ?\text{- skolem} {?X}, {?X:\text{skolem} \) will also succeed, but the \( \text{skolem} \) class contains all Skolem terms, while the \( \text{isskolem} {...} \) primitive is true of Skolem constants only.

Finally, we note that both the \( \text{isskolem} {...} \) primitive and the \( \text{skolem} \) class require that the argument (the class instance being tested) must be bound.

## 14 Testing Meta-properties of Symbols and Variables

Sometimes it useful to be able to be able to find out to what kind symbol a particular variable is bound or even whether that variable is bound to a term or not. In Section 13, we already saw the \( \text{isskolem} {...} \) primitive, which can tell whether a particular symbol is a Skolem constant. Here is a summary of all such meta-predicates. For the meaning of the IRI and string constants, please refer to Section 41.

- \( \text{isnumber} \{\text{Arg}\} \) — tests whether the argument is (or is bound to) a number.
- \( \text{isinteger} \{\text{Arg}\} \) — tests whether the argument is (or is bound to) an integer number.
- \( \text{isfloat} \{\text{Arg}\} \) — tests whether the argument is (or is bound to) a floating point number.
- \( \text{isdecimal} \{\text{Arg}\} \) — tests if the argument is (or is bound to) a decimal number. At present, this is the same as \( \text{isnumber} \{\text{Arg}\} \).
- \( \text{isatom} \{\text{Arg}\} \) — tests whether the argument is (or is bound to) a Prolog atom.
- \( \text{iscompound} \{\text{Arg}\} \) — tests whether the argument is (or is bound to) a compound term, i.e., a term that has a non-zero-ary function symbol.
- \( \text{isatomic} \{\text{Arg}\} \) — tests if the argument is (or is bound to) a Prolog atom or a number.
- \( \text{islist} \{\text{Arg}\} \) — tests if the argument is (or is bound to) a list term.
- \( \text{ischarlist} \{\text{Arg}\} \) — tests whether the argument is (or is bound to) a list or ASCII characters.
- \( \text{isiri} \{\text{Arg}\} \) — tests whether the argument is (or is bound to) an IRI data type.
• \texttt{isstring\{Arg\}} — tests whether the argument is (or is bound to) a string data type.

• \texttt{issymbol\{Arg\}} — tests whether the argument is (or is bound to) an abstract symbol. An abstract symbol is any atom that is not an internal representation of a string or an IRI. (These internal representations involve special unprintable characters and thus are unlikely to be used by a normal user directly.)

• \texttt{isvar\{Arg\}} — tests if the argument is an unbound variable.

• \texttt{isnonvar\{Arg\}} — tests if the argument is not an unbound variable.

• \texttt{isground\{Arg\}} — tests if the argument is a ground term (or is bound to one).

• \texttt{isnonground\{Arg\}} — tests if the argument is not a ground term.

• \texttt{variables\{Term,List\}} — binds \texttt{List} to the list of all the variables that occur in \texttt{Term}.

• \texttt{cloneterm\{Term,ClonedTerm\}} — creates a copy of \texttt{Term} with the same constants and function symbols, but variables are consistently renamed to become new variables.

In addition, some of the above primitives have \textit{delayable} 2-argument versions. A delayable version differs in that if the first argument is a variable then evaluation of such a builtin is delayed until the argument gets bound. If the argument does not get bound at the end of the query computation, then the outcome depends on the second \textit{mode}-argument: if the mode is \textit{must} then an error is issued; if the mode is \textit{wish} then the builtin is quietly evaluated to \textit{false}. For instance,

\begin{verbatim}
  \texttt{ergo> isinteger\{?X\}.}
  \texttt{No}
  \texttt{ergo> isinteger\{?X\}, ?X=1.}
  \texttt{No}
  \texttt{ergo> isinteger\{?X,wish\}, ?X=1.}
  \texttt{?X = 1}
  \texttt{Yes}
  \texttt{ergo> isinteger\{?X,must\}, ?X=1.}
\end{verbatim}
?X = 1

Yes

ergo> isinteger(?X,must).

++Abort[Ergo]> in file (runtime) on line 1: instantiation error in builtin:
    isinteger(_h3464); unbound argument

ergo> isinteger(?X,wish).

No

Thus, the delayable versions of the above primitives are insensitive to the order in which they appear in the rule body, which makes them sometimes easier to use and renders their behavior more logical. On the other hand, the delayable versions cannot serve as guards for subsequent evaluations. For example, if foo(?X) expects ?X to be an integer then

... :- ..., isinteger(?X,must), foo(?X), ...

will not prevent calling foo/1 with ?X an unbound variable, since isinteger(Arg,Mode) will be delayed past the moment foo(?X) is evaluated. Using isinteger(?X) instead will do the job.

The delayable versions of the aforesaid builtins are listed below. The delayable versions of isvar{Arg,Mode}, isnonvar{Arg,Mode}, isground{Arg,Mode}, and isnonground{Arg,Mode} have slightly different semantics.

- isnumber{Arg,Mode} — the delayable version of isnumber{Arg}.
- isinteger{Arg,Mode} — the delayable version of isinteger{Arg}.
- isfloat{Arg,Mode} — the delayable version of isfloat{Arg}.
- isdecimal{Arg,Mode} — the delayable version of isdecimal{Arg}.
- isatom{Arg,Mode} — the delayable version of isatom{Arg}.
- iscompound{Arg,Mode} — the delayable version of iscompound{Arg}.
- isatomic{Arg,Mode} — the delayable version of isatomic{Arg}.
- islist{Arg,Mode} — the delayable version of islist{Arg}.
• `ischarlist{Arg,Mode}` — the delayable version of `ischarlist{Arg}`.

• `isiri{Arg,Mode}` — the delayable version of `isiri{Arg}`.

• `isstring{Arg,Mode}` — the delayable version of `isstring{Arg}`.

• `issymbol{Arg,Mode}` — the delayable version of `issymbol{Arg}`.

• `isvar{Arg,Mode}` — the delayable version of `isvar{Arg}`. If the argument `?X` in `isvar{?X,must}` \emph{at the end of the query computation is not} an unbound variable, an error is issued. Otherwise, the result is true. For `isvar{?X,wish}`, the evaluation is delayed and then `?X` is tested. If it is unbound, the result is true; otherwise, it is false. No errors are issued.

• `isnonvar{Arg,Mode}` — the delayable version of `isnonvar{Arg}`. If `?X` in `isnonvar{?X,must}` \emph{at the end of the query computation} is a variable, an error is issued. Otherwise, the result is true. For `isnonvar{?X,wish}`, the evaluation is delayed and then `?X` is tested. If it is bound, the result is true; otherwise, it is false. No errors are issued.

• `isground{Arg,Mode}` — the delayable version of `isground{Arg}`. If `?X` in `isground{?X,must}` \emph{at the end of the query computation} is non-ground, an error is issued. Otherwise, the result is true. For `isground{?X,wish}`, the evaluation is delayed and then `?X` is tested. If it is bound to a ground term, the result is true; otherwise, it is false. No errors are issued.

• `isnonground{Arg,Mode}` — the delayable version of `isnonground{Arg}`. If `?X` in `isnonground{?X,must}` \emph{at the end of the query computation} is ground, an error is issued. Otherwise, the result is true. For `isnonground{?X,wish}`, the evaluation is delayed and then `?X` is tested. If it is bound to a ground term, the result is false; otherwise, it is true. No errors are issued.

15 Lists, Sets, Ranges. The Operators \textbackslash in, \textbackslash subset, \textbackslash sublist

List is a very important data structure in \textsc{ergo}, which has several useful representations as a term. The simplest is just an enumeration like `[a21,12,?X,cde,?Y,pqr]`, which contains five items: three symbols (`a21`, `cde`, `pqr`) one integer (12) and two variables (`?X`, `?Y`).

In addition, the term `[elt1,elt2,...,eltk | rest]` represents a list that has `elt1`, `elt2`, ..., `eltk` in the \emph{front} (the ... is not part of the syntax, but is intended to convey the fact that the front of the list can have arbitrary length) and \emph{rest} is the tail of the list. For instance, the aforementioned list `[a21,12,?X,cde,?Y,pqr]` can be alternatively represented as `[a21,12 | [cde,?Y,pqr]]`, or `[a21,12 | [?X,cde,?Y,pqr]]`, or `[a21 | [12,?X,cde,?Y,pqr]]`, and in two more ways. Very often the term to the right of \textbar{} is a variable, which is a convenient way to split off a tail of a list at a desired point. For instance,
... \([a_{21}, 12, 33, \text{cde}, ?Y, \text{pqr}] = [a_{21}, 12, ?X | ?\text{Tail}]\) ...

will unify the two list-terms and will result in ?\text{Tail} getting bound to \([\text{cde}, ?Y, \text{pqr}]\) and ?\text{X} to 33.

**Set** (along with maps, dictionaries) is a data structure that is supported in \(\varepsilon\text{RGO}\) only. It provides for efficient ways to store and search unordered collections of data. Details of these data structures can be found in Section 48.6.

**Range** is a data structure that represents an ordered collection of numbers in a certain range or of characters in a range (usually ASCII characters, but more generally could be characters in any supported character set. Examples include 23..76 (integers between 23 and 77), 2.34..7 (numbers 2.34, 3.34, 4.34, 5.34, 6.34), 7..5 (numbers can go down: 7, 6, 5), b..d (characters b, c, d), or f..'? ' (characters f, e, d, ..., down to '?' in the ASCII table).

**The \textbackslash in operator.** This operator allows one to test whether a term unifies with a member of a list, of a range, or (in \(\varepsilon\text{RGO}\)) of a set:

\begin{verbatim}
?- 5 \text{in} 2..9, \text{abc} \text{in} [2,3,\text{abc},9]. // is true
?- f(?X) \text{in} \text{set123}. // ?X = 3, if \text{set123} represents an \varepsilon\text{RGO} set that has f(3)
\end{verbatim}

Another important use of the \textbackslash in operator is to successively bind a variable to every member of a list, range, or a set. For instance,

\begin{verbatim}
?- ?X \text{in} a..k, p(?X),
?Y \text{in} [\text{abc, cde, efg}], q(?Y).
\end{verbatim}

successively binds ?\text{X} to the symbols a, b, ..., k and checks if any of them are in predicate (or database table) p and then binds ?\text{Y} successively to \text{abc, cde, efg} and checks if any of them are in q. The answer to this query is a set of binding pairs ?\text{X}=x, ?\text{Y}=y such that x is in the interval a..k and p(x) is true and y is one of the constants abc, cde, or efg such that q(y) is true.

**The \textbackslash subset operator.** This operator is a convenient way to test if one list is a subset (ignoring the order of the elements) of another list. In \(\varepsilon\text{RGO}\), it can also be used to test if one set is a subset of another. For instance,

\begin{verbatim}
?- [a,b(?X)] \text{subset} [1,b(8),3,c,a]. // is true and ?X gets bound to 8
?- \text{set1} \text{subset} \text{set2}. // true, if \text{set1, set2} are \varepsilon\text{RGO} sets and every
// member of \text{set1} unifies with some member of \text{set2}
\end{verbatim}

**The \textbackslash sublist operator.** This operator applies to lists only. A subgoal like \text{list1} \textbackslash sublist \text{list2} checks if \text{list1} unifies with a sublist of \text{list2}. Checking for sublists preserves the order of the elements, but not adjacency. For instance,
?- [1,3,6,5] \ sublist [1,2,3,4,6,7,5]. // true: same order, but not adjacency
?- [1,3,6,5] \ sublist [1,2,3,4,5,6]. // false: order not preserved

16 Multifile Knowledge Bases

\textit{ERGO} supports many ways in which a knowledge base can be modularized. First, it can be split into many files with separate namespaces. Each such file can be considered an independent library, and the different libraries can call each other. In particular, the same method name (or a predicate) can be used in different files and the definitions will not clash. Second, a file can be composed of several files, and these files can be included by the preprocessor prior to the compilation. In this case, all files share the same namespace in the sense that the different rules that define the same method name (or a predicate) in different files are assumed to be part of one definition. Third, \textit{ERGO} knowledge bases can invoke Prolog modules and vice versa. In this way, a large system can be built partly in Prolog and partly in \textit{ERGO}.

We discuss each of these modularization methods in turn.

16.1 \textit{ERGO} Modules

A \textit{ERGO} \textit{module} is an abstraction that allows a large knowledge base to be split into separate libraries that can be reused in multiple ways in the same system. Formally, a module is a pair that consists of a \textit{name} and a \textit{contents}. The name must be an alphanumeric symbol (the underscore character, \texttt{\_}, is also allowed), and the contents consists of part of the knowledge base that is typically loaded from some file (but can also be constructed runtime by inserting facts into another module).

The basic idea behind \textit{ERGO} modularization is that reusable code libraries are to be placed in separate files. To use a library, it must be \textit{loaded into a module}. Other parts of the knowledge base can then invoke this library’s methods by providing the name of the module (and the method/predicate names, of course). The exported methods and predicates can be called by other parts of the knowledge base. (A module can have non-public methods, if the module is encapsulated — see Section 16.12.) In this way, the library loaded into a module becomes that module’s content.

Note that there is no a priori association between files and modules. Any file can be loaded into any module and the same file can be loaded even into two different modules at the same time. The same module can be reused during the same \textit{ERGO} session by loading another file into that module. In this case, the old contents is erased and the module gets new contents from the second file.

In \textit{ERGO}, modules are completely decoupled from file names. A knowledge base knows only the module names it needs to call, but not the file names. Specific files can be loaded into modules
by some other, unrelated bootstrapping code. Moreover, a knowledge base can be written in such a way that it invokes a method of some module without knowing that module’s name. The name of the module can be passed as a parameter or in some other way and the concrete binding of the method to the module will be done at runtime.

This dynamic nature of ERGO modules stands in sharp contrast to the module system of Prolog, which is static and associates modules with files at compile time. Moreover, to call a predicate from another module, that predicate must be imported explicitly and referred to by the same name.

As a pragmatic measure, ERGO defines three kinds of modules rather than just one. The kind described above is actually just one of the three: the user module. As explained, these modules are decoupled from the actual code, and so they can contain different code at different times. The next kind is a Prolog module. This is an abstraction in ERGO, which is used to call Prolog predicates. Prolog modules are static and are assumed to be closely associated with their code. We describe these modules in Section 16.7. (Do not confuse ERGO Prolog modules — an abstraction used in the language of ERGO — with Prolog modules, which is an abstraction used in Prolog.) The third type of modules are the ERGO system modules. These modules are preloaded with ERGO and provide useful methods and predicates (e.g., I/O) and, thus, are also static. These modules are described in Section 16.9 and 48. The abstraction of system modules is a convenience provided by ERGO, which enables users to perform common actions using standard names of predicates and methods implemented in those modules. The syntactic conventions for calling each of these types of modules are similar, but distinct.

### 16.2 Calling Methods and Predicates Defined in User Modules

If literal is a frame or a predicate defined in another user module, it can be called using the following syntax:

```
literal @ module
```

The name of the module can be any alphanumeric symbol.\(^6\) For instance, `foo(a) @ foomod` tests whether `foo(a)` is true in the user module named `foomod`, and `Mary[children -> ?X]@genealogy` queries the information on Mary’s children available in the module `genealogy`. More interestingly, the module specifier can be a variable that gets bound to a module name at run time. For instance,

```
..., ?Agent=Zagat, ..., NewYork[dinner(Italian) -> ?X]@?Agent.
```

A call to a literal with an unbound module specification or one that is not bound to a symbol will result in a runtime error.

\(^6\) In fact, any symbol is allowed. However, it cannot contain the quote symbol, “’”.
When calling the literals defined in the same module, the \@module notation is not needed, of course. (In fact, since knowledge bases do not know where they will be loaded, using the \@module idiom to call a literal in the same module is difficult. However, it is easy to do with the help of the quasi-constant \@, which is described later, and is left as an exercise.)

The following rules apply when calling a literal defined in another module:

1. Literal reference cannot appear in a rule head or be specified as a fact. For example, the following will generate a parsing error

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{foo}(?X) @ \text{foomod} & : - \text{goo}(?X). \\
\end{align*}
\]

because defining a literal that belongs to another module does not make sense.

2. Module specification is distributive over logical connectives, including the conjunction operator, “,”, the disjunction, “;”, and the negation operators, “\+” and “\af”. For example, the formula below:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{John}[\text{father}->\text{Smith}], \af \text{Smith}[\text{spouse}->\text{Mary}] @ \text{foomod}
\end{align*}
\]

is equivalent to the following formula:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{John}[\text{father}->\text{Smith}] @ \text{foomod}, \af (\text{Smith}[\text{spouse}->\text{Mary}] @ \text{foomod})
\end{align*}
\]

3. Module specifications can be nested. The one closest to a literal takes effect. For example,

\[
\begin{align*}
(\text{foo}(a), \text{goo}(b) @ \text{goomod}, \text{hoo}(c)) @ \text{foomod}
\end{align*}
\]

is equivalent to

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{foo}(a) @ \text{foomod}, \text{goo}(b) @ \text{goomod}, \text{hoo}(c) @ \text{foomod}
\end{align*}
\]

4. The module specification propagates to any frame appearing in the argument of a predicate for which the module is specified. For example,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{foo}(a.b[c->d]) @ \text{foomod}
\end{align*}
\]

is equivalent to

\[
\begin{align*}
a[b->?X] @ \text{foomod}, ?X[c->d] @ \text{foomod}, \text{foo}(?X) @ \text{foomod}
\end{align*}
\]
5. Module specifications do not affect function terms that are not predicates or method names, unless such a specification is explicitly attached to such a term. For instance, in

\[ ?- \text{foo(goo(a)) @ foomod}. \]

\text{goo/1} refers to the same functor both in module \text{foomod} and in the calling module. However, if the argument is \textit{reified} (i.e., is an object that represents a formula — see Section 18.2), as in

\[ ?- \text{foo(${goo(a) @ goomod}) @ foomod}. \]

then \text{foo/1} is assumed to be a meta-predicate that receives the query \text{goo(a)} in module \text{goomod} as a parameter. Moreover, module specification propagates to any reified formula appearing in the argument of a predicate for which the module is specified. For example,

\[ ?- \text{foo(${goo(a)}) @ foomod}. \]

is equivalent to

\[ ?- \text{foo(${goo(a) @ goomod}) @ foomod}. \]

### 16.3 Finding the Current Module Name

Since a \texttt{ERGO} knowledge base can be loaded into any module, it does not have a priori knowledge of the module it will be executing in. However, the knowledge base can find its module at runtime using the quasi-constant \texttt{@}, which is replaced with the current module name when the module is loaded. More precisely, if \texttt{@} occurs anywhere as an oid, method name, value, etc., in file \texttt{foo.ergo} then when \texttt{foo.ergo} is loaded into a module, say, \texttt{bar}, then all such occurrences of \texttt{@} are replaced with \texttt{bar}. For instance,

\[ a[b->@]. \]

\[ ?- a[b->?X]. \]

\[ ?X=main \]

\[ Yes \]
16.4 Finding the Module That Invoked A Rule

Sometimes it is useful to find out which module called any particular rule at run time. This can be used, for example, when the rule performs different services for different modules. The name of the caller-module can be obtained by calling the primitive `caller(?X)` in the body of a rule. Alternatively, the `\?C` quasi-variable can be used. For instance,

```
p(?X) :- caller(?X), (write('I was called by module: '), writeln(?X))@\prolog.
p(?X) :- ?X=\?C, (write('I was called by module: '), writeln(?X))@\prolog.
```

When a call to predicate `p(?X)` is made from any module, say `foobar`, and the above rule is invoked as a result, then the message “I was called by module: foobar” will be printed.

16.5 Loading Files into User Modules

`ERGO` provides several commands for compiling and loading files into specified user modules.

Compilation. The command

```
?- compile{myfile>>mymodule}.
```

generates the byte code for the program to be loaded into the user module named `mymodule`. In practice this means that the compiler generates files named `myfile_mymodule.P` and `myfile_mymodule.xwam` with symbols appropriately renamed to avoid clashes.

If no module is specified, the command

```
?- compile{myfile}.
```

compiles `myfile.ergo` for the default module `main`.

Loading. The above commands compile files without actually loading their contents into the in-memory knowledge base. To load a file, the following commands can be used:

```
?- [myfile].
only
?- load{myfile}.
```
This command loads the byte code of the program in the file *myfile.ergo* into the default user module *main*. If a compiled byte code of the program for the module *main* already exists and is newer than the source file, the byte code is used. If *myfile.ergo* is newer than the compiled byte code (or if the byte code does not exist), then the source file is recompiled and then loaded.

An optional module name can be given to tell ĖRGO to load the program into a specified module:

```
?- [myfile >> foomod].
?- load{myfile >> foomod}.
```

This loads the byte code of the ĖRGO program *myfile.ergo* into the user module named *foomod*. As with the previous form of that command, if a compiled byte code of the program for the module *foomod* already exists and is newer than the source file, the byte code is used. If *myfile.ergo* is newer than that compiled byte code (or if the byte code does not exist), then the source file is recompiled and then loaded.

The user can compile and load several program files at the same time: If the file was not compiled before (or if the program file is newer), the program is compiled before being loaded. For instance, the following command:

```
?- [mykb1, mykb2]
```

will load both *mykb1* and *mykb2* into the default module *main*. However, simply loading several knowledge bases into the same module is not very useful: the content of the last file will wipe out the code of the previous ones. This is a general rule in ĖRGO. Thus, loading multiple files is normally used in conjunction with the module targets:

```
?- ['mykb1.ergo', mykb2 >> foomod].
```

which loads *mykb1.ergo* into the module *main* and *mykb2.ergo* into the module *foomod*.

**Adding to already loaded modules.** Files can also be added to an existing module, as explained in the following subsection.

Note that the [...] command can also load and compile Prolog programs. The overall algorithm is as follows. If the file suffix is specified explicitly, the corresponding file is assumed to be a ĖRGO file, a Prolog file, or a byte code depending on the suffix: *.ergo*, *P*, or *.xwam*. If the suffix is not given explicitly, the compiler first checks if *mykb.ergo* exists. If so, the file assumed to contain ĖRGO code and is compiled as such. If *mykb.ergo* is not found, but *mykb.P* or *mykb.xwam* is, the file is passed to Prolog for compilation.
Sometimes it is useful to know which user modules are loaded or if a particular user module is loaded (say, because you might want to load it, if not). To find out which modules are loaded at the present time, use the primitive `isloaded{...}`. For instance, the first query, below, succeeds if the module `foo` is loaded. The second query succeeds and binds `L` to the list of all user modules that are loaded at the present time.

?- isloaded{foo}.
?- ?L = setof{?X|isloaded(?X)}.

`setof` and other aggregate operators are discussed in Section 30.

One can also check which files are loaded in what modules and in what mode. The mode is `load` or `add`, and the file names are absolute path names. For instance,

?- isloaded{?F,?Module,?Mode}.
?F = /a/b/c/foo.flr
?Module = bar
?Mode = load

?F = /a/b/foo2.flr
?Module = bar
?Mode = add

?F = /a/b/d/bar.flr
?Module = main
?Mode = add

There is also a four-place version of `isloaded`: `isloaded{FileAbsName,Module,FileLocalName,Mode}`. The difference is that argument 3 is now the local version of the file name (without the directory part). This version is useful in many ways. For instance, it lets one find the full name of the current file. To do so, recall that `ERGO` has a quasi-variable `\@F`, which represents the `local` file name. So, the query

?- isloaded{?FullFile,\@,\@F,?}.

will bind `?FullFile` to the absolute name of the file where the above query occurs.

**Scratchpad code.** In some cases—primarily for testing—it is convenient to be able to type up and load small excerpts of code into a running `ERGO` session. To this end, the system provides special idioms, [], [>>module], [+], and [>>+module]. This causes `ERGO` to start reading input
clauses from the standard input and load them into the default module or the specified module. To indicate the end of the input, the user can type Control-D in Unix-like systems or Control-Z in Windows. For instance,

```
  ergo> [>>foo].
  aaa[bbb->ccc].

  Control-D
```

**A word of caution.** It is dangerous to place the `load{...}` command in the body of a rule if `load{...}` loads a file into the same module where the rule belongs. For instance, if the following rule is in module `bar`

```
  p(X) :- ..., [foo>>bar], ...
```

then execution of such a rule is likely to crash Prolog. This is because this very rule will be wiped out before it finishes execution — something that XSB is not ready for. **ERGO** tries to forewarn the user about such dangerous occurrences of `load{...}`, but it cannot intercept all such cases reliably.

### 16.6 Adding Rule Bases to Existing Modules

Loading a file into a module causes the knowledge base contained in that module to be erased before the new information is loaded. Sometimes, however, it is desirable to *add* knowledge (rules and facts) contained in a file to an existing module. This operation does not erase the old contents of the module. For instance each of the following commands

```
  %- [+mykb >> foomod].
  or
  %- add{mykb >> foomod}.
```

will *add* the rules and facts contained in the file `mykb.ergo` into the module `foomod` without erasing the old contents. The following commands

```
  %- [+mykb].
  %- add{mykb}.
```

will do the same for module `main`. Note that, in the `[...]` form, loading and adding can be freely mixed. For instance,
?- [foo1, +foo2]

will first load the file foo1.ergo into the default module main and then add the contents of foo2.ergo to that same module.

Like the loading commands, the addition statements first compile the files they load if necessary. It is also possible to compile files for later addition without actually adding them. Since files are compiled for addition a little differently from files compiled for loading, we use a different command:

?- compileadd{foo}.
?- compileadd{foo >> bar}.

16.7 Calling Prolog Subgoals from \texttt{ERGO}

Prolog predicates can be called from \texttt{ERGO} through the \texttt{ERGO} module system \texttt{ERGO} models Prolog programs as collections of static Prolog modules, i.e., from \texttt{ERGO}'s point of view, Prolog modules are always available and do not need to be loaded explicitly because the association between Prolog programs and modules is fixed.

\texttt{@\prolog} and \texttt{@\plg}. The syntax to call Prolog predicates is one of the following:

?- \texttt{predicate@prolog(module)}

For instance, since the predicate \texttt{member/2} is defined in the Prolog module \texttt{basics}, we can call it as follows:

?- \texttt{member(abc,[cde,abc,pqr])@prolog(basics)}.

\texttt{plg} instead of \texttt{prolog} also works.

To use this mechanism, you must know which Prolog module the particular predicate is defined in. Some predicates are defined by programs that do not belong to any module. When such a Prolog program is loaded, the corresponding predicates become available in the default Prolog module. In XSB, the default module is called \texttt{usermod} and \texttt{ERGO} can call such predicates as follows:

?- \texttt{foo(?X}@prolog(usermod)}.

Note that variables are not allowed in the module specifications of Prolog predicates, i.e.,

?- \texttt{?M=usermod, foo(?X}@prolog(?M)}. 
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will cause a compilation error.

Some Prolog predicates are considered “well-known” and, even though they are defined in various Prolog modules, the user can just use those predicates without remembering the corresponding Prolog module names. These predicates (that are listed in the XSB manual) can be called from ERGO with particular ease:

?- writeln('Hello')@prolog

i.e., we can simply omit the Prolog module name (but parentheses must be preserved).

@prologall and @plgall. The Prolog module specification @prolog has one subtlety: it does not affect the arguments of a call. For instance,

?- foo(f(?X,b))@prolog.

will call the Prolog predicate foo/1. Recall that ERGO uses HiLog terms to represent objects, while Prolog uses Prolog terms. Thus, the argument f(?X,b) above will be treated as a HiLog term. Although it looks like a Prolog term and, in fact, HiLog terms generalize Prolog terms, the internal representation of HiLog and Prolog terms is different. Therefore, if the fact foo(f(a,b)) is defined somewhere in the Prolog program then the above query will fail, since a Prolog term f(?X,b) and a HiLog term f(?X,b) are different even though their textual representation in ERGO is the same.

A correct call to foo/1 in this case would be as follows:

?- foo(f(?X,b))@prolog@prolog.

Here we explicitly tell the system to treat f(?X,b) as a Prolog term. Clearly, this might be too much writing in some cases, and it is also error prone. Moreover, bindings returned by Prolog predicates are Prolog terms and they somehow need to be converted into HiLog.

To simplify calls to Prolog, ERGO provides another, more powerful primitive: @prologall. In the above case, one can call

?- foo(f(?X,b))@prologall.

without having to worry about the differences between the HiLog representation of terms in ERGO and the representation used in Prolog.

One might wonder why is there the @prolog module call in the first place. The reason is efficiency. The @prologall call does automatic conversion between Prolog and HiLog, which
is not always necessary. For instance, to check whether a term, $f(a)$, is a member of a list, $[f(b),f(a)]$, one does not need to do any conversion, because the answer is the same whether these terms are HiLog terms or Prolog terms. Thus,

$$?- \text{member}(f(a), [f(b),f(a)])\@\text{prolog(basics)}.$$  

is perfectly acceptable and is more efficient than

$$?- \text{member}(f(a), [f(b),f(a)])\@\text{prologall(basics)}.$$  

ℰRGO provides a special primitive, $p2h\{\ldots,\ldots\}$, which converts terms to and from the HiLog representation, and the knowledge engineer can use it in conjunction with $\@\text{prolog}$ to achieve a greater degree of control over argument conversion. This issue is further discussed in Section 18.4.

**Builtin Prolog predicates.** There is a large number of low-level builtin predicates in the underlying Prolog system. Most of these builtins have been lifted to the ℰRGO level in various ways and made easier to use. Other predicates were not lifted because they were subsumed by various ℰRGO's constructs. Nevertheless, there still are XSB predicates whose lifting is not being planned because of their rare use, but which can still be useful in some cases. A partial list of such predicates appears in Section 54.

### 16.8 Calling ℰRGO from Prolog

Since Prolog does not understand ℰRGO syntax, it can call only predicates (not frames) defined in ℰRGO knowledge bases. To expose such predicates to Prolog, they must be imported by the Prolog program.

#### 16.8.1 Importing ℰRGO Predicates into Prolog

To import a ℰRGO predicate into a Prolog shell, the following must be done:

- The query
  $$?- [flora2], bootstrap_ergo.$$  
  must be executed first. If you are importing ℰRGO predicates into a Prolog program, say **test.P**, and not just into a Prolog shell then the above must be executed *before compiling or loading test.P* and the following additional directive must appear near the top of **test.P**, *prior to any call to ℰRGO predicates*:

```prolog
```
:- import ('\flimport')/1 from flora2.

- One of the following '\flimport' queries must be executed in the shell:

\[- \text{\textbackslash flimport'' flora-predicate/arity as xsb-name(\_,\_,\ldots,\_)}
\quad \text{from filename >> flora-module-name} \]
\[- \text{\textbackslash flimport'' flora-predicate/arity as xsb-name(\_,\_,\ldots,\_)}
\quad \text{from flora-module-name} \]

We will explain shortly which '\flimport' query should be used in what situation. Note that a double-backslash is required in front of \texttt{flimport} because in Prolog the backslash is an escape character. This is also the reason why the backslash appears twice in the various commands in the rest of this section.

**Note:** You must let Prolog know the location of your installation of \texttt{ERGO}. This is done by executing the prolog instruction \texttt{asserta(library_directory(path-to-flora))}. For instance

\[- \text{add_lib_dir(a('/home/me/ergo'))}. \]

before calling any of the \texttt{ERGO} modules. Observe that \texttt{asserta} and \texttt{not assert} must be used.

The first form for '\flimport' above is used to both import a predicate and also to load the file containing it into a given \texttt{ERGO} user module. The second syntax is used when the \texttt{ERGO} knowledge base is already loaded into a module and we only need to import the corresponding predicate.

In '\flimport', \texttt{flora-predicate} is the name of the imported predicate as it is known in the \texttt{ERGO} module. For non-tabled predicates, whose names start with \% in \texttt{ERGO}, \texttt{flora-predicate} should have the following syntax: \%(\texttt{predicate-name}). For instance, to import a \texttt{ERGO} non-tabled predicate \%\texttt{foobar} of arity 3 one can use the following statement:

\[- \text{'\flimport' \%'(foobar)/3 as foobar(\_,\_,\_) from mymodule}. \]

The imported predicate must be given a name by which this predicate will be known in Prolog. (This name can be the same as the name used in \texttt{ERGO}.) It is important, however, that the Prolog name be specified as shown, i.e., as a predicate skeleton with the same number of arguments as in the \texttt{ERGO} predicate. For instance, \texttt{foo(\_,\_,\_)} will do, but \texttt{foo/3} will not. Once the predicate is imported, it can be used under its Prolog name as a regular predicate.

Prolog programs can also load and compile \texttt{ERGO} knowledge bases using the following queries (again, \texttt{bootstrap_ergo} must be executed in advance):
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```prolog
:- import '\load'/1, '\compile'/1 from flora2.
?- '\load'(flora-file >> flora-module).
?- '\load'(flora-file).
?- '\compile'(flora-file >> flora-module).
?- '\compile'(flora-file).
```

The first query loads the file `flora-file` into the given user module and compiles it, if necessary. The second query loads the knowledge base into the default module `main`. The last two queries compile the file for loading into the module `flora-module` and `main`, respectively, but do not load it.

Finally, a Prolog program can check if a certain ERGO user module has been loaded using the following call:

```prolog
:- import '\isloaded'/1 from flora2.
?- '\isloaded'(flora-module-name).
```

Note that in Prolog the `\isloaded` predicate must be quoted and the backslash doubled.

**Note:** You must make sure that Prolog will find this installation and use it. One way of doing this was described earlier (by executing an appropriate `asserta/1`). This method works best if your application consists of both ERGO and Prolog modules, but the initial module of your application (i.e., the one that bootstraps everything) is a Prolog program. If the initial module is an ERGO knowledge base, then the best way is to start XSB and ERGO using the `runergo` script (page 2) located in the distribution of ERGO.

### 16.8.2 Passing Arbitrary Queries to ERGO

The method of calling ERGO from Prolog, which we just described, assumes that the user knows which predicates and methods to call in the ERGO module. Sometimes, it is useful to be able to pass arbitrary queries to ERGO. This is particularly useful when ERGO runs under the control of a Java or C program.

To enable such unrestricted queries, ERGO provides a special predicate, `ergo_query/5`, which is called from Prolog and takes the following arguments:

- **String**: A string that contains a ERGO query. It can be an atomic frame (e.g., `foo[bar->?X].`) or a list of character codes (e.g., `"foo[bar->?X]."`).
- **Vars**: A list of the form `[?Name1=Var1, ?Name2=Var2,...]` or `["?Name1"=Var1, "?Name2"=Var2,...]`. ?Name is a name of a variable mentioned in String, for instance, `?X` (note: the name must be quoted, since it is a Prolog atom). Var is a Prolog (not ERGO!)
variable where you want the binding for the variable Name in String to be returned. For instance, if String is 'p(?X,?Y).' then Vars can be ['?X' = Xyz, "?Y" = Qpr]. In this case, Xyz will be bound to the value of ?X in p(?X,?Y) after the execution, and Qpr will be bound to the value of ?Y in p(?X,?Y).

- **Status**: Indicates the status of compilation of the command in String. It is a list, which contains various indicators. The most important ones are success and failure.

- **Exception**: If the execution of the query is successful, this variable is bound to normal. Otherwise, this variable will contain an exception term returned by XSB (see the XSB manual, if you need to process exceptions in sophisticated ways).

In order to use the ergo_query/5 predicate from within Prolog, the following steps are necessary:

1. The ERGO installation directory must be added to the XSB search path:
   
   ```prolog
   ?- add_lib_dir(a('/home/myHomeDir/ergo')).
   ```

2. The query
   
   ```prolog
   ?- [flora2], bootstrap_ergo
   ```
   
   must be executed before compiling or loading the Prolog file.

3. ergo_query/5 must be imported from flora2.

Here is an example of a Prolog file, test.P, which loads and then queries a ERGO file, flrtest.ergo:

```prolog
:- import bootstrap_ergo/0 from flora2.
?- add_lib_dir(a('/home/myHomeDir/ergo')), [flora2], bootstrap_ergo.
:- import ergo_query/5 from flora2.
:- import '\load'/1 from flora2.

?- '\load'(flrtest).

?- Str='?X[b->?Y].', ergo_query(Str,'?X'=YYY,'?Y'=PPP, _Status,_XWamState,_Exception).
```
After the query to flrtest.ergo is successfully executed, the bindings for the variable $?X in the ERGO query will be returned in the Prolog variable YYY. The binding for $?Y in the query will be returned in the Prolog variable PPP. If there are several answers, you can get them all using a fail-loop, as usual in Prolog. For instance,

?- Str='?X[b->?Y].',
   ergo_query(Str,['?X'=YYY,'?Y'=PPP],_Status,_XWamState,_Exception),
   writeln('?X' = YYY),
   writeln('?Y' = PPP),
   \false.

Note that the Prolog variables in the variable list (like YYY and PPP above) can be bound and in this way input to the ERGO query can be provided. For instance,

?- YYY=abc,
   ergo_query('?X[b->?Y].',,['?X'=YYY,'?Y'=PPP],_Status,_XWamState,_Exception).

yields the same result as

?- ergo_query('abc[b->?Y].',,['?Y'=PPP],_Status,_XWamState,_Exception).

However, the user should be aware of the fact that if a query is going to be used many times with different parameters then the first form is much faster. That is,

?- YYY=abc1,
   ergo_query('?X[b->?Y].',,['?X'=YYY,'?Y'=PPP],_Status,_XWamState,_Exception).
?- YYY=abc2,
   ergo_query('?X[b->?Y].',,['?X'=YYY,'?Y'=PPP],_Status,_XWamState,_Exception).
   ....

is noticeably faster than

?- ergo_query('abc1[b->?Y].',,['?Y'=PPP],_Status,_XWamState,_Exception).
?- ergo_query('abc2[b->?Y].',,['?Y'=PPP],_Status,_XWamState,_Exception).
   ....

if the above queries are executed thousands of times with different parameters abc1, abc2, etc.

The rest of the arguments for ergo_query/5 are as follows:
• **Status**: If the query was parsed successfully, this variable is bound to `normal`. Otherwise, it will be bound to an appropriate compiler error message.

• **XWamState**: If the query succeeds, the answer may be true or undefined in the well-founded semantics. If `XWamState =:= 0`, it means the answer is true. Otherwise, it is undefined.

• **Exception**: If a runtime exception is thrown during the execution of the query, this variable will be bound to the term representing that exception.

### 16.9 ERGO System Modules

ERGO provides a special set of modules that are *preloaded* with useful utilities, such as data type manipulation or I/O. These modules have special syntax, `\modname`, and cannot be loaded by the user. For this reason, these modules are called ERGO system modules. For instance, to write to the standard output one can use

```prolog
?- write(Something)\io.
```

For more details on the currently existing ERGO system modules see Section 48.

### 16.10 Including Files into ERGO Knowledge Bases

The last and the simplest way to construct multi-file ERGO knowledge bases is via the `#include` preprocessing directive. For instance if file `foo.ergo` contains the following instructions:

```prolog
#include "file1"
#include "file2"
#include "file3"
```

the effect is the same as if the above three files were concatenated together and stored in `foo.ergo`. Note that the file names must be enclosed in *double* quotes.

Unix-style path names (i.e., using forward slashes) are understood universally and irrespective of the actual OS under which ERGO runs. So, for portability, it is recommended to use only Unix-style path names relative to the directory of the host file that contains the include-directive (e.g., `"../abc/cde.foo"`).

If one does need to use Windows-style path names for some reason, keep in mind that backslashes in path names must be doubled. For instance,

```prolog
#include "../\foo\bar.ergo "
```
16.11 More on Variables as Module Specifications

Earlier we mentioned that a user module specification can be a variable, e.g., a[m->b]@?X, which ranges over module names. This variable does not need to be bound to a concrete module name before the call is made. If it is a variable, then ?X will get successively bound to the user modules where a[m->b] is true. However, these bindings will not include \prolog, \prolog(module), or \module.

Dynamic module bindings can be used to implement adaptive methods, which are used in many types of applications, e.g., agent programming. Consider the following example:

```
Module foo

something :- ...

something_else :-
    a[someservice(\@,?Arg)->?Res]@moo

......

....... a[someservice(?Module,?Arg)-> ?Res] :-

......

Module moo

......
```

Here the method someservice in user module moo performs different operation depending on who is calling it, because something can be defined differently for different callers. When something_else is called in module foo, it invokes the method someservice on object a in module moo. The current module name (foo) is passed as a parameter (with the quasi-constant \@). When someservice is executed in module moo it therefore calls the predicate something in module foo. If someservice is called from a different module, say bar, it will invoke something defined in that module and the result might be different, since something in module bar may have a different definition than in module foo.

An example of the use of the above idea is the pretty printing module of \ERGO. A pretty-printing method is called on an object in some user module, and to do its job the pretty-printing method needs to query the object in the context of the calling module to find the methods that the object has.

It is also possible to view adaptive methods as a declarative counterpart of callback functions in C/C++, which allows the callee to behave differently for different clients.

16.12 Module Encapsulation

So far, in multi-module knowledge bases, any module could invoke any method or predicate in any other module. That is, modules were not encapsulated. However, \ERGO lets the user encapsulate
any module and export the methods and predicates that other modules are allowed to call. Calling
an unexported method or predicate will result in a runtime error.

A module is encapsulated by placing an `export` directive in it or by executing an `export`
directive at run time. Modules that do not have `export` directives in them are not encapsulated,
which means that any method or predicate defined inside such a module can be called from the
outside.

**Syntax.** The `export` directive has the form:

\[-\text{export}\{\text{MethodOrPredExportSpec}1,\ \text{MethodOrPredExportSpec}2,\ \ldots\}\].

There can be one or more export specifications (`MethodOrPredExportSpec`) in each `export`
statement, and there can be any number of different `export` statements in a module. The effect of all
these statements is cumulative.

Each `MethodOrPredExportSpec` specifies three things, two of which are optional:

- The list of methods or predicates to export.
- The list of modules to which to export. This list is optional. If it is not given then the
  predicates and modules are exported to all modules.
- Whether the above are exported as `updatable` or not. If a method or a predicate is exported as
  updatable, then the external modules can add or delete the corresponding facts. Otherwise,
  these modules can only query these methods and predicates. If `updatable` is not specified,
  the calls are exported for querying only.

The exact syntax of a `MethodOrPredExportSpec` is as follows:

\[
[\text{updatable}]\ \text{ExportList} \ [\gg \text{ModuleList}]
\]

The square brackets here denote optional parts. The module list is simply a comma-separated list
of modules and `ExportList` is a comma-separated list of `predicate/method/ISA templates`. Method
templates have the form

\[
[\ \text{termTemplate} \rightarrow \ ?] \quad \text{or} \quad \?
[\ \text{termTemplate}]
\]
and predicate templates have the same form as term templates. A term template is a HiLog term that has no constants or function symbols in it. For instance, \( p(?,?)() \) and \( q(?,?,:) \) are term templates, while \( p(a,?)() \) and \( q(?,?,f(?)) \) are not.

ISA templates have the form \(?::?\) or \(?::?:\). Of course, \(?_\) can also be used instead of ?.

Examples. Here are some examples of export directives:

\[
\begin{align*}
&:- \text{export}\{p(?,?)\}. \\
&:- \text{export}\{[a(?) \rightarrow ?]\}. \\
&:- \text{export}\{[a(?) \rightarrow ?]\}. \\
&:- \text{export}\{[b \rightarrow ?], [c(?,:), ?[d(?),(?,?) \rightarrow ?]\}. \\
&:- \text{export}\{[e \rightarrow ?], [f(?,?):] >> (\text{foo, bar})\}. \\
&:- \text{export}\{\text{updatable } ([g \rightarrow ?], [h(?,:)]) >> (\text{foo, bar})\}. \\
&:- \text{export}\{\text{updatable } ([g \rightarrow ?], [h(?,:)]) >> (\text{foo, bar}), \quad [k \rightarrow ?], m(?,(?,)?)(?)) >> \text{abc}\}.
\end{align*}
\]

Observe that the method \( g \) and the boolean method \( h \) have been exported in the updatable mode. This means that the modules \( \text{foo} \) and \( \text{bar} \) can insert and delete facts of the form \( a([g\rightarrow b]) \) and \( a(h(b,c)) \) using the statements like (assuming that \( \text{moo} \) is the name of the module that includes the above directives):

\[
\begin{align*}
&?- \text{insert}\{a[g\rightarrow b]@\text{moo}\}. \\
&?- \text{delete}\{a[h(b,c)]@\text{moo}\}.
\end{align*}
\]

Parenthescizing rules. Note that the last three export statements above use parentheses to disambiguate the syntax. Without the parentheses, these statements would be understood differently:

\[
\begin{align*}
&:- \text{export}\{[e \rightarrow ?], ([f(?,:),?) >> \text{foo}), \text{bar}\}. \\
&:- \text{export}\{\text{updatable } [g \rightarrow ?], ([h(?,:)]) >> \text{foo}), \text{bar}\}. \\
&:- \text{export}\{\text{updatable } [g \rightarrow ?], ([h(?,:)]) >> \text{foo}), \text{bar}, \quad [k \rightarrow ?], (m(?,(?,)?)(?) >> \text{abc})\}.
\end{align*}
\]

We should also note that \texttt{updatable} binds stronger than the comma or \texttt{>>, which means that an export statement such as the one below} 

\[
:- \text{export}\{\text{updatable } [g \rightarrow ?], [h(?,:)] >> \text{foo}\}.
\]

is actually interpreted as 

\[
:- \text{export}\{\text{updatable}(?, [h(?,:)] >> \text{foo})\}.
\]
Exporting frames other than ->. In order to export any kind of call to a non-Boolean method, one should use only ->. This will allow other modules to make calls, such as a/[d(c)(e,f) -> ?X], a[b ->-> ?Z], and c[e=>t] to the exported methods. The export directive does not allow the user to separately control calls to the F-logic frames that involve method specifiers such as +>>, =>, ->->, etc.

The export directive has an executable counterpart. For instance, at run time a module can execute an export instruction such as

?- export{[e -> ?], ([f(?,?]) >> foo), bar}.

and export the corresponding methods. If the module was not encapsulated before, it will become now. Likewise, it is possible to execute export directives in another module. For instance executing

?- export{[e -> ?], ([f(?,?]) >> foo), bar}@foo.

will cause the module foo to export the specified methods and to encapsulate it, if it was not encapsulated before.

16.13 Importing Modules

Referring to methods and predicates defined in other modules is one way to invoke knowledge defined separately elsewhere. Sometimes, however, it is convenient to import the entire module into another module. This practice is particularly common when it comes to reusing ontologies.

ERGO supports import of entire modules through the importmodule compile-time directive. Its syntax is as follows:

:- importmodule{module1, module2, ..., module-k}.

Once a module is imported, its methods and predicates can be referenced without the need to use the @module idiom.

Importing a module is not the same as including another module as a file with the #include statement. First, only exported methods and predicates can be referenced by the importing module. The non-exported elements of an imported module are encapsulated. Second, even when everything is exported (as in the case when no explicit export directive is provided), import is still different from inclusion. To see why, consider one module, main, that looks like this:

?- [mykb>>foo].
This module loads the contents of the file `mykb.ergo` into a module `foo` and then imports that module. The importing module itself contains a fact and a query.

Suppose `mykb.ergo` is as follows:

```
q(?X) :- p(?X).
p(123).
```

It is easy to see that the query `q(?X)` in the importing module `main` will return the answer `?X = 123`. In contrast, if the module `main` included `mykb.ergo` instead of importing it, i.e., if it looked like this:

```
#include "mykb.ergo"
p(abc).
?- q(?X).
```

then the same query would have returned two answers: `?X = 123` and `?X = abc`. This is because the latter is simply

```
q(?X) :- p(?X).
p(123).
p(abc).
?- q(?X).
```

In other words, in the first case, the query `q(?X)` still queries module `foo` even though the query does not use the `@foo` idiom. The module `foo` has only one answer to the query, so only one answer is returned. In contrast, when `mykb.ergo` is included then the resulting knowledge base has two `p`-facts and two answers are returned.

**Note:** If module `modA` imports module `modB` then `modB` must be loaded before any query is issued against `modA`. Otherwise, `modA` might attempt to query `modB` and an error will be issued telling the user that `modB` is not loaded. A good practice to avoid this sort of errors is to load `modB` before `modA`. 
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16.14 Persistent Modules

Normally, the data in a ERGO module is **transient** — it is lost as soon as the system terminates. The ERGO package **persistentmodules** allows one to make ERGO modules **persistent**. This package is described in the document *A Guide to ERGO Packages*.

16.15 Fast Loading Vast Amounts of Data

When one needs to load vast amounts of data (hundreds of thousands to millions of facts), running them through the regular ERGO compiler can take too long because that compiler is built to recognize the rich syntax of ERGO. In contrast, large data sets invariably have very simple structure and it would be a waste to run a complex compiler to import all that data. To this end, ERGO provides special primitives to load, query, and destroy such vast amounts of data provided the input has very regular structure: Prolog (not HiLog) terms with no infix, prefix, or postfix operators. It can contain ERGO preprocessor commands (Section 44) and comments, but the comments must be either enclosed between /* ... */ or be one-line comments beginning with a % (*i.e.*, Prolog style, not ERGO style).

For instance, the following input would work

```prolog
foo(1, bar(abc, cde), q2).
foo(2, bar(ab, ce), q3).
bar(23, foo(123, [a, b, c]), "q33").
```

but the following will cause errors and loading will be aborted:

```prolog
foo(2, bar(ab, ce), q3).  ; ok
foo(1+2, abc).            ; nope: + is an infix operator
bar(2, foo(123, "q33")  ; nope: parentheses missing
pqr(1, ?f(2, g(3))).     ; nope: ?f(2,...) is a HiLog term
pqr(1, ff(2, ${g(3)})).  ; nope: reification (${g(3)}) isn’t allowed
```

The fast-loaded facts are placed in a special storage container that is not accessible to regular queries: these facts are to be queried via a special primitive. The primitives for fast-loading and working with these storage containers are as follows:

- **fastload**(FileName, Storage) — fast load Filename into storage container Storage. FileName must have the extension .P and Storage must be an alphanumeric string. Executing multiple fastload commands on the same storage will add all facts up from the files involved. Duplicates are eliminated.

Example: ?- fastload{myfile, mystorage}.  

Portions Copyright © 2013–2018 Coherent Knowledge
• **fastquery**\{**Storage**, **Query**\} — query the information stored in the storage container **Storage**. **Query** must be a HiLog term. Other forms are also allowed, but they will return nothing, as they will not match the input of the form described above. Variables in the query term are allowed. Note also that even though the input consists of Prolog terms, they are converted to HiLog so HiLog terms can be used to query the information stored in these containers.

Examples:

```prolog
?- fastquery{mystorage,?X}.
?- fastquery{mystorage,?Y(p,q)}.
?- fastquery{mystorage,r(p,q)}.
```

• **fasterase**\{**Storage**\} — erase all the information in the given storage container.

Example: `?- fasterase{mystorage}.`

**Notes:**

• The **fastload** command should not occur in the body of any rule that has a tabled head-literal—directly or indirectly (via other rules). The most straightforward way to call **fastload** is via a top-level query, as in the above examples.

• The intended use of **fastload** is that the data will be loaded early in the process, before any kind of significant queries were computed. It is not an error to call **fastload** after such queries, but then the tables associated with those queries will be abolished. The result will be that, if the same or related queries are asked again, they will be recomputed from scratch, resulting in a delay.

### 17 Truth about Relative File Names and Current Directories

When loading, adding, or opening files, it is often convenient to use relative names. In multifile applications, the use of relative file names becomes not just a matter of convenience, but of necessity because absolute file names make applications non-portable. To properly use relative names in **ERGO**, one must understand how the **current directory** is determined in various situations. The present section explains this and related issues.

Absolute file names (the ones starting with ‘/’ in Linux and Mac and those starting with \\ in Windows) do not depend on the location of the **ERGO** file in which they appear and so they can be used in load/add commands and in I/O operations without the fear of ambiguity. Not so with relative file names like **foo/bar.flr** or **../moo.flr**. These depend on the **current directory** in which **ERGO** executes at the moment when these files are being used. So, what is this “current directory?” This can be summarized as follows:
• When ERGO starts, the current directory is the directory in which ERGO was started. Namely,
  - If ERGO was started from a command window then the current directory of ERGO is the current directory of that window unless that directory is non-writable or is ERGO’s installation directory. In the latter cases, the current directory is user’s home directory.
  - If it was started by clicking on an icon (via ERGO Studio) then the current directory is the user’s home directory.

• During loading or adding of an ERGO’s file, the current directory is that file’s directory. If, during loading, that file loads another file, the current directory temporarily is switched to the directory of that latter file.

• When file loading is finished, the current directory returns to what it was before the loading.

• The current directory of ERGO can be changed at run time by executing the subgoal File[chdir(myNewDir)]@\io — see Section 48.1.

Now, regarding the relative file names that occur in the load{...} and add{...} commands, the following natural rule holds:

• Any relative file name used in the load{...} or add{...} command is always relative to the directory of the file in which that load/add command occurs.

This behavior is desirable because it greatly facilitates creation of location-independent multi-file knowledge bases.

The other common place where file names occur are I/O operations, like tell(myfile), which opens myfile for writing (see Section 48.1 for more details on I/O). Here the situation is more subtle because I/O commands can execute in many different contexts, not necessarily in the context of the file in which they are physically located. For that reason, the rule is that

• any relative file name that occurs in an I/O command is always relative to the directory that is current at the time that command is executed.

For example, we know from the above that during loading of a file the current directory is the directory of that file. Therefore, if a query like

?- tell(abc)@\io, writeln(abcdefg)@\io, told@\io.

occurs in a file /foo/bar/moo/myfile.flr then, when that file will be loaded, the file abc will be created in the directory /foo/bar/moo/ and its contents will be a single line abcdefg. This is because, as we discussed, the current directory during loading of a file is that file’s directory. In contrast, if our file has a rule
makefile(?X) :- tell(?X)@\io, writeln(12345678)@\io, told@\io.

and makefile(cde) is called at some point, this will create a file, called cde and containing the single line 12345678, in the directory that was current at the time tell(?X)@\io (and makefile(cde)) was called.

Thus, the context in which files are interpreted in I/O commands is not uniform and depends on how these commands are called—a somewhat unpleasant situation. Fortunately, to rectify this problem, ERGO provides a primitive, here{...}, which takes any subgoal and calls it in the directory of the file in which here{...} occurs. For instance, with a slightly modified rule

makefile(?X) :- here{tell(?X)@\io}, writeln(12345678)@\io, told@\io.

a call makefile(cde) will create cde in the directory of our example file, i.e. /foo/bar/moo/, and not in the directory where makefile(cde) was called.

Finally, we note that here{...} can take any goal, even a complex one, provided it is enclosed in parentheses. For instance, here{(p(?X,?Y),q(?Y))}. In fact, this primitive can be used to temporarily localize the context of execution for any subgoal, not only for I/O commands.

18 HiLog and Meta-programming

HiLog [4] is the default syntax that ERGO uses to represent functor terms (including object Ids) and predicates. In HiLog, complex terms can appear wherever a function symbol is allowed. For example, group(?X)(?Y,?Z) is a HiLog term where the functor is no longer a symbol but rather a complex term group(?X). Variables in HiLog can range over terms, predicate and function symbols, and even over base formulas. For instance,

\[ ? - p(?X), ?X(p). \]

and

\[ ? - p(?X), ?X(p), ?X. \] (3)

are perfectly legal queries. If p(a(b)), a(b)(p), and a(b) are all true in the database, then ?X = a(b) is one of the answers to the query in HiLog.

Although HiLog has a higher order syntax, its semantics is first order [4]. Any HiLog term can be consistently translated into a Prolog term. For instance, group(?X)(?Y,?Z) can be represented by the Prolog term apply(apply(group,?X),?Y,?Z). The translation scheme is pretty straightforward and is described in [4].

Any Id-term in ERGO, including function symbols and predicate symbols, are considered to be HiLog terms and therefore are subject to translation. That is, even a normal Prolog term
will by default be represented using the HiLog translation, e.g., \texttt{foo(a)} will be represented as \texttt{apply(foo,a)}. This guarantees that HiLog unification will work correctly at runtime. For instance, \texttt{foo(a)} will unify with \texttt{?F(a)} and bind the variable \texttt{?F} to \texttt{foo}.

There is one important difference between HiLog, as described in \cite{4}, and its implementation in \texttt{ERGO}. In HiLog, functor terms that appear as arguments to predicates and the base formulas (i.e., predicates that are applied to some arguments) belong to the same domain. In contrast, in \texttt{ERGO} they are in different domains.\footnote{This is allowed in \textit{sorted HiLog} \cite{3}.} For instance, suppose \texttt{p(a(b))} is true, and consider the following query:

\begin{verbatim}
?- \?X ~ a(b), p(?X).
\end{verbatim}

Here \texttt{-} is a meta-unification operator to be discussed shortly, in Section 18.1; it binds \texttt{?X} to the base formula \texttt{a(b)} in the current module. The answer to this query is 'No' because \texttt{?X} is bound to the base formula \texttt{a(b)}, while \texttt{a(b)} in \texttt{p(a(b))} is a HiLog term.

Our earlier query, (3), will also not work (unlike the original HiLog) because \texttt{?X} is bound to a term and not a formula: if we execute the query (3), we will get an error stating that \texttt{?X} is bound to a HiLog term, not a predicate, and therefore the query \texttt{?X} is meaningless. To correct the problem, \texttt{?X} must be promoted to a predicate and relativized to a concrete module—in our case to the current module. So, the following query \textit{will} work and produce a binding \texttt{a(b)} for \texttt{?X}.

\begin{verbatim}
?- p(?X), ?X(p), ?X @ @.
\end{verbatim}

Like in classical logic, \texttt{foo} and \texttt{foo()} are different terms. However, it is convenient to make these terms synonymous when they are treated as predicates. Prologs often disallow the use of the \texttt{foo()} syntax altogether. The same distinction holds in HiLog: \texttt{foo}, \texttt{foo()} and \texttt{foo()()} are all different. In terms of the HiLog to Prolog translation, this means that \texttt{foo} is different from \texttt{flapply(foo)} is different from \texttt{flapply(apply(foo))}. However, just like in Prolog, we treat \texttt{p} as syntactic sugar for \texttt{p()} when both occur as predicates. Thus, the following queries are the same:

\begin{verbatim}
?- p.
?- p().
\end{verbatim}

In the following,

\begin{verbatim}
p.
q().
?- p(), ?X().
?- q, ?X().
?- r = r().
\end{verbatim}
the first two queries will succeed (with ?X bound to p or q), but the last one will fail. Making p and p() synonymous does not make them synonymous with p()()—the latter is distinct from both p and p() not only as a term but also as a formula. Thus, in the following, all queries fail:

```
p.
q().
?- p().
?- q().
?- p = p().
?- q() = q().
```

18.1 Meta-programming, Meta-unification

F-logic together with HiLog is powerful stuff. In particular, it lends itself naturally to meta-programming. For instance, it is easy to examine the methods and types defined for the various classes. Here are some simple examples:

```
// all unary methods defined for John
?- John[?M(?) -> ?].

// all unary methods that apply to John,
// for which a signature was declared
?- John[?M(?) => ?].

// all method signatures that apply to John,
// which are either declared explicitly or inherited
?- John[?M => ?].

// all method invocations defined for John
?- John[?M -> ?].
```

However, a number of meta-programming primitives are still needed since they cannot be directly expressed in F-logic. Many such features are provided by the underlying Prolog system and ERGO simply takes advantage of them:

```
?- functor(?X,f,3)@prolog.
?X = f(_h455,_h456,_h457)@prolog
Yes
```
?- arg(2,f(?X,3)@prolog,?Y)@prolog.
?Y = 3
Yes

Note that these primitives are used for Prolog terms only and are described in the XSB manual. These primitives have not been ported to work with HiLog terms yet.

**Meta-unification.** In ERGO, a variable can be bound to either a formula or a term. For instance, in $?X = p(a), p(a) is viewed as a term and $?X is bound to it. Likewise, in $?X = a[m->v], the frame is evaluated to its object value (which is a) and then unified with $?X. To bind variables to formulas instead, ERGO provides a meta-unification operator, ~. This operator treats its arguments as formulas and unifies them as such. For instance, $?X ~ a[m->v,k->?V] binds $?X to the frame a[m->v,k->?V] and a[m->v,k->?V] ~ $?X[m->v,k->p] unifies the two frames by binding $?X to a, $M to m, and $?V to p.

Meta-unification is very useful when it is necessary to determine the module in which a particular formula lives. For instance,

?- $?X@?M ~ a[b->c]@foo.

would bind $?X to the formula a[b->c], $?M to the module of $?X. Note that in meta-unification the variable $?X in the idiom $?X@?M or $?X@foo is viewed as a meta-variable that is bound to a formula. More subtle examples are

?- $?X ~ f(a), $?X ~ $?Y@?M.
?- f(a)@foo ~ $?Y@?M.

$M is bound to the current module in the first query and foo in the second one. $?Y is bound to the (internal representation of the) HiLog formula f(a)@ in the first query and f(a)@foo in the second — not to the HiLog term f(a)!

Another subtlety has to do with the scope of the module specification. In ERGO, module specifications have scope and inner specifications override the outer ones. For instance, in

..., (abc@foo, cde)@bar, ...

the term abc is in module foo, while cde is in module bar. This is because the inner module specification, @foo, overrides the outer specification @bar for the literal in which it occurs (i.e., abc). These scoping rules have subtle impact on literals that are computed dynamically at run time. For instance, consider
?- ?X@?M ~ a[b->c]@foo, ?X@bar.

Because ?X gets bound to a[b->c]@foo, the literal ?X@bar becomes the same as (a[b->c]@foo)@bar, i.e., a[b->c]@foo. Thus, both of the following queries succeed:

?- ?X@?M ~ a[b->c]@foo, ?X@bar ~ a[b->c]@foo.
?- ?X@?M ~ a[b->c]@foo, ?X@?N ~ a[b->c]@foo.

Moreover, in the second query, the variable ?N is not bound to anything because, as noted before, the literal ?X@?N becomes (a[b->c]@foo)@?N) at run time and, due to the scoping rules, is the same as a[b->c]@foo.

Meta-disunification. The negation of meta-unification is \textit{meta-disunification}, \textit{!~}. For instance,

?- abc !~ neg cde.

Yes

Note that \texttt{neg}, \texttt{\naf}, and \texttt{\+} tie stronger than \texttt{~} and \texttt{!~}, so the above is parsed as \texttt{abc!~neg(cde)} and \texttt{neg cde!~abc} is parsed as \texttt{neg(cde)!~abc} — not as \texttt{neg(cde!~abc)}.

18.2 Reification

It is sometimes useful to be able to treat ERGO frames and predicates as objects. For instance, consider the following statement:

\texttt{Tom[believes-> Alice[thinks->Flora2:coolThing]].}

The intended meaning here is that one of Tom’s beliefs is that Alice thinks that Flora2 is a cool thing. However, minute’s reflection shows that the above has a different meaning:

\texttt{Tom[believes-> Alice].}
\texttt{Alice[thinks->Flora2:coolThing].}

\footnote{This is in contrast to \texttt{=}, \texttt{==}, \texttt{<}, etc., which bind stronger than \texttt{neg}, \texttt{\naf}, and \texttt{\+}. For instance, \texttt{neg cde=abc} is parsed as \texttt{neg(cde=abc)}. This difference in parsing makes sense because \texttt{~} and \texttt{!~} expect formulas as its operands, while \texttt{=} and \texttt{==}, and other comparison operators expect terms.}
That is, Tom believes in Alice and Alice thinks that Flora2 is cool. This is different from what we originally intended. For instance, we did not want to say that Alice likes ERO (she probably does, but she did not tell us). All we said was what Tom has certain beliefs about what Alice thinks. In other words, to achieve the desired effect we must turn the formula $\text{Alice}[\text{thinks} \rightarrow \text{Flora2:coolThing}]$ into an object, i.e., *reify* it.

Reification is done using the operator ${...}$. For instance, to say that Tom believes that Alice thinks that Flora2 is a cool thing one should write:

$$\text{Tom}[\text{believes} \rightarrow {\{\text{Alice}[\text{thinks} \rightarrow \text{Flora2:coolThing}]\}}].$$

When reification appears in facts or rule heads, then the module specification and the predicate part of the reified formula must be bound. For instance, the following statements are illegal:

$$p({?X\text{foo}}) \leftarrow q(?X).$$
$$p({q(a)@?M}).$$
$$?- \text{insert}\{p({?X@?M})\}.$$

The semantics of reification in ERO is described in [19].

**Reification of complex formulas.** In ERO, one can reify not only simple facts, but also anything that can occur in a rule body. Even a set of rules can be reified! The corresponding objects can then be manipulated in ways that are semantically permissible for them. For instance, reified conjunctions of facts can be inserted into the database using the `insert{...}` primitive. Reified conjunctions of rules can be inserted into the rulebase using the `insertrule{...}` primitive. Reified rule bodies, which can include disjunctions, negation, and even things like aggregate functions and update operators(!), can be called as queries.

```prolog
request[
    input -> ${?Ticket[from->?From, to->?To, \text{naf international}],
  inputAxioms -> ${(?Ticket[international] :-
        ?Ticket[from->?From:?Country1, to->?To:?Country2],
        ?Country1 \= ?Country2)}
]
].
  insertrule{?Rules},
  ?Input.
```
In the above example, the object request has two attributes, which return reified formulas. The input attribute returns a Boolean combination of frames, while inputAxioms returns a reified rule. In general, conjunctions of rules are allowed inside the reification operator (e.g., {$((\text{rule1}), \ (\text{rule2}))$}, where each rule is enclosed in a pair of parentheses. Such a conjunction can then be inserted (or deleted) into the rulebase using the insertrule{...} primitive.\footnote{In fact, Boolean combinations of rules are also allowed inside the reification operator. However, such combinations cannot be inserted into the rulebase. ERGO does not impose limitations here, since is impossible to rule out that a knowledge base designer might use such a feature in creative ways.}

Note that rule Ids and other meta-data (see Section 36) can be supplied with reified rules just like it can be with regular rules. For instance,

\[ \ldots \ :- \ ?X=${@!{abc[\text{tag->}foo]}} \ \text{head}(\?X):-\text{body}(\?X,\?Y)}. \]

Reification and meta-unification. Reification should not be confused with meta-unification, although they are closely related concepts. A reified formula reflects the exact structure that is used to encode it, so structurally similar, but syntactically different, formulas might meta-unify, but their internal representations could be very different. For instance,

\[- \ a[b->?X]\@?M \sim ?Y[b->d]\@\text{foo}. \]

will return true, because the two frames are structurally similar and thus meta-unify. On the other hand,

\[- \ ?{a[b->?X]\@?M} = ?{?Y[b->d]\@\text{foo}}. \]

will be false, because $a[b->?Y]\@?X$ and $?Z[b->d]\@\text{foo}$ have different internal representations (even though their conceptual structures are similar), so they do not unify (using “=”", i.e., in the usual first-order sense). Note, however, that the queries

\[- \ ?{a[b->?Y]\@\text{foo}} = ?{?Z[b->d]\@\text{foo}}. \]
\[- \ ?M=\text{foo}, \ ?{a[b->?Y]\@?M} = ?{?Z[b->d]\@?M}. \]
\[- \ a[b->?Y]\@\text{foo} \sim ?Z[b->d]\@\text{foo}. \]
\[- \ ?M=\text{foo}, \ a[b->?Y]\@?M \sim ?Z[b->d]\@?M. \]

will all return true, because $a[b->?Y]\@\text{foo}$ and $?Z[b->d]\@\text{foo}$ are structurally similar — both conceptually and as far as their internal encoding is concerned (and likewise are $a[b->?Y]\@\text{foo}$ and $?Z[b->d]\@\text{foo}$).
18.3 Meta-decomposition

ERGO supports an extended version of the Prolog meta-decomposition operator “=..”. On Prolog terms, it behaves the same way as one would expect in Prolog. For instance,

```prolog
?- ?X=p(a,?Z)@prolog, ?X=..?Y.
?X = p(a,_h4094)@prolog
?Z = _h4094
?Y = [p, a, _h4094]
```

The main use of the =.. operator in ERGO is, however, for decomposing HiLog terms or reifications of HiLog predicates and F-logic frame literals. The meta-decomposition operator uses special conventions for these new cases.

For HiLog terms, the head of the list on the right-hand side of =.. has the form hilog(HiLogPredicateName). For instance,

```prolog
?- p(a,b) =.. ?L.
?L = [hilog(p), a, b]
```

For HiLog predicates the head of the list has the form hilog(HiLogPredicateName,Module). For instance,

```prolog
?- $p(a,b)@foo =.. ?L.
?L = [hilog(p,foo), a, b]
```

For non-tabled HiLog predicates, which represent actions with side-effects, the head of the list is similar except that '%hilog' (quoted!) is used instead of hilog. For instance,

```prolog
?- $%p(a,b)@foo =.. ?L.
?L = [%hilog'(p,foo), a, b]
```

For frame literals, the head of the list has the form flogic(FrameSymbol,Module). The FrameSymbol argument represents the type of the frame and can be one of the following: ->, *->, =>, *=>, *++>, ->->, *->->, ::, ::; boolean (tabled Boolean methods), *boolean (class-level tabled Boolean methods), %boolean (transactional, nontabled Boolean methods), ::=, [] (empty frames, such as a[]). Here are a number of examples that illustrate the use of =.. for decomposition of frames:
$\{a[b->c]\@foo\} = .. \ [flogic(->,foo), a, b, c]$

$\{a[b->c]\@foo\} = .. \ [flogic(\ast->',foo), a, b, c]$

$\{a[b->c]\@foo\} = .. \ [flogic(\ast \ast->',foo), a, b, c]$

$\{a[b->c]\@foo\} = .. \ [flogic(\ast \ast \ast->',foo), a, b, c]$

$\{a[b->c]\@foo\} = .. \ [flogic(\ast \ast \ast \ast->',foo), a, b, c]$

$\{a:b\@foo\} =.. \ [flogic(:,foo), a, b]$  

$\{a::b\@foo\} =.. \ [flogic(:::,foo), a, b]$  

$\{a:=:b\@foo\} =.. \ [flogic(:=:,foo), a, b]$  

$\{a[]\@foo\} =.. \ [flogic([],foo), a]$  

$\{a[p]\@foo\} =.. \ [flogic(boolean,foo), p]$  

$\{a[p]\@foo\} =.. \ [flogic('%boolean',foo), a, p]$  

$\{a[p]\@foo\} =.. \ [flogic('\%boolean',foo), a, p]$  

The =.. operator supports explicit negation (Section 19.5). The corresponding type designators are neg_hilog and neg_flogic. For instance,

$\{\neg a[b->c]\@foo\} = .. \ [negation(neg), a[b->c]\@main]$  

$\{\neg p(a,b)\@foo\} = .. \ [negation(neg), p(a,b)\@main]$  

$\{\naf a[b->c]\@foo\} = .. \ [negation(naf), a[b->c]\@main]$  

$\{\naf p(a,b)\@foo\} = .. \ [negation(naf), p(a,b)\@main]$  

Additional examples:

$\{\text{foo;bar}\} = .. \ [logic(or),\{\text{foo}\},\{\text{bar}\}]$  

$\{\text{if }\text{foo}\text{ then }\text{bar}else \text{ moo}\} = .. \ [control(ifthenelse),\text{main},\{\text{foo}\},\{\text{bar}\},\{\text{moo}\}]$  

$\{\text{while }\text{foo }do \text{bar}\} = .. \ [control(whiledo),\text{main},\{\text{foo}\},\{\text{bar}\}]$  

$\{\text{insert}\{?V\text{p(?V)}\}\} = .. \ [update(insert),\{?V\},\{p(?V)\}]$  

$\{\text{deleteall}\{?V\text{p(?V)}\}\} = .. \ [update(deleteall),\{?A\},\{p(?A)\}]$  

$\{\text{Xrain}\{?V\text{p(?V)}\}\} = .. \ [logic(and),\{?Xocide\=\min(?V\text{p(?V)})\},\{?X\text{\=T}\}]$  

avg(?V\text{\=T}\text{p(?V)\text{\=T})} = .. \ [aggregate(avg),?V,\{?T\},\{p(?V)\text{\=T}\},?Result]$  

count(?V\text{\=G}\text{p(?V)\text{\=G})} = .. \ [aggregate(count),?V,\{?G\},\{p(?C)\text{\=G}\},?R]$  

$\{\text{insert}(p,\{q:-r\})\} = .. \ [update(insert),\text{main},\{p\},\{q :- r\}]$.  

$\{\text{delete}(p,\{q:-r\})\} = .. \ [update(delete),\text{main},\{p\},\{q :- r\}]$.  

$\{\text{wish}(\text{nonvar}(\text{?X})\text{\=p(?X)})\} = .. \ [quantifier(delay),\text{wish},\{\text{nonvar}(\text{?X})\text{\=plg}\},\{p(?X)\}]$.  

The =.. operator is bi-directional, which means that either one or both of its arguments can be bound. For instance,
?- ?X =.. [flogic('*boolean',foo),a,p].

?X = ${a[|p|]@foo}

However, that last feature, while it works for most statements, is not fully implemented in the sense that the terms produced (if produced at all) on the left-hand side might not be a valid E\RGO term or formula or the internal representations may be slightly different.

The statements for which the reverse mode of ?Variable =.. ?List has not yet been implemented include clause{...}, newmodule{...}, and some others. The statements for which =.. is not fully reversible are the update operators, statements, and a few others. For instance, while

?- ${insert{p,(q:-r)}} =.. [update(insert),main,[${p}, ${q :- r}]].

succeeds, the following will fail:

?- ${delete{p,(q:-r)}} =.. [update(delete),main,[${p}, ${q :- r}]].

because the internal representations of the two sides of =.. happen to be slightly different. Nevertheless, =.. does produce valid insert- and delete-statements from appropriate list on the right side. For instance,

?- ?I =.. [update(insert),main,[${p}, ${r}, ${q :- r}]], ?I.
?- p,q,r.

will succeed, i.e., a valid insert statement was constructed in ?I and the call ?I did perform the insertion. Likewise,

?- ?D =.. [update(delete),main,[${p}, ${r}, ${q :- r}]], ?D.

constructs a proper delete statement for ?D and a call to ?D then performs the deletion.

The low-level Prolog =.. is also available using the idiom (?Term =.. ?List)@\prolog. This is rarely needed, however. One might use this when the term to be decomposed is known to be a Prolog term (in this case the Prolog’s operator will run slightly faster) or if one wants to process the Prolog terms into which E\RGO literals are encoded internally (which is probably hardly ever necessary).

18.4 Passing Parameters between E\RGO and Prolog

The native HiLog support in E\RGO causes some tension when crossing the boundaries from one system to another. The reason is that E\RGO terms and Prolog terms have different internal
representations. Even though XSB supports HiLog (according to the manual, anyway), this support is incomplete and is not integrated well into the system — most notably into the XSB module system. As a result, XSB does not recognize terms passed to it from ERGO as HiLog terms and, thus, many useful primitives will not work correctly. (Try `- writeln(foo(abc)) @\prolog` and see what happens.)

To cope with the problem, ERGO provides a primitive, `p2h(?Plg, ?Hlg)`, which does the translation. If the first argument, `?Plg`, is bound, the primitive binds the second argument to the HiLog representation of the term. If `?Plg` is already bound to a HiLog term, then `?Hlg` is bound to the same term without conversion. Similarly, if `?Hlg` is bound to a HiLog term, then `?Plg` gets bound to the Prolog representation of that term. If `?Hlg` is bound to a non-HiLog term, then `?Plg` gets bound to the same term without conversion. In all these cases, the call to `p2h(...)` succeeds. If both arguments are bound, then the call succeeds if and only if

- `?Plg` is a Prolog term and `?Hlg` is its HiLog representation.
- Both `?Plg` and `?Hlg` are identical Prolog terms.

Note that if both `?Plg` and `?Hlg` are bound to the same HiLog term then the predicate fails. Thus, if you type the following queries into the ERGO shell, they both succeed:

```
?- p2h(?X,f(a)), p2h(?X,?X).
```

but the following will fail:

```
?- p2h(f(a),?X), p2h(?X,?X).
?- p2h(f(a),f(a)).
```

The first query succeeds because `?X` is bound to a Prolog term, and by the above rules `p2h(?X,?X)` is supposed to succeed. The second query fails because `?X` is bound to a HiLog term and, again by the above rules, `p2h(?X,?X)` is supposed to fail. The reason why the last query fails is less obvious. In that query, both occurrences of `f(a)` are HiLog terms, as are all the terms that appear in an ERGO knowledge base (unless they are marked with `@\prolog` or `@\prologall` module designations). Therefore, again by the rules above the query should fail.

One should not try to convert certain Prolog terms to HiLog and expect them to be the same as similarly looking ERGO terms. In particular, this applies to reified statements. For instance, if `?X = $a[b->c]` then `- p2h(?X,?Y), ?Y = $a[b->c]` is not expected to succeed. This is because `p2h(...)` does not attempt to mimic the ERGO compiler in cases where conversion to HiLog (such as in the case of reified statements) makes no sense. Doing so would have substantially increased the run-time overhead.
Not all arguments passed back and forth to Prolog need conversion. For instance, `sort/2`, `ground/1`, `compound/1`, and many others do not need conversion because they work the same for Prolog and HiLog representations. On the other hand, most I/O predicates require conversion. ERGO provides the `io` library, described in Section 48, which provides the needed conversions for the I/O predicates.

Another mechanism for calling Prolog modules, described in Section 16.7, is use of the `@\prologall` and `@\prologall(module)` specifiers (`@plgall` also works). These specifiers cause the compiler to include code for automatic conversion of arguments to and from Prolog representations. However, as mentioned above, such conversion is sometimes not necessary and the use of `@\prologall` might incur unnecessary overhead.

### 19 Negation

ERGO supports three kinds of negation: a Prolog-style negation `\+` [5]; default negation based on well-founded semantics, denoted `\naf`, [13, 14]; and explicit negation `\neg`, which is analogous to what is called “classical” negation in [7].

These three types of negation are quite different and should not be confused. Prolog-style negation does not have a model-theoretic semantics and it is unsatisfactory in many other respects. It is included in ERGO for completeness and is primarily used when one needs to negate a Prolog predicate (in which case it is much faster than default negation). Explicit negation is mostly syntactic sugar that enables one to represent negative information explicitly. Default negation is a logically sound version of Prolog-style negation.

#### 19.1 Default Negation `\naf` vs. Prolog Negation `\+`

ERGO has three operations for negation: `\naf`, `\+`, and `\neg`. In this subsection we discuss the first two and Section 19.5 describes the third.

Prolog negation is specified using the operator `\+`. Negation based on the well-founded semantics is specified using the operator `\naf`. The well-founded negation, `\naf`, applies to predicates that are tabled (i.e., predicates that do not have the `%` prefix to be discussed in detail in Section 24) or to frames that do not contain transactional methods (i.e., methods prefixed with a `%`).

The semantics for Prolog negation is simple. To find out whether `\+ Goal` is true, the system first asks the query `?- Goal`. If the query fails then `\+ Goal` is said to be satisfied. Unfortunately, this semantics is problematic. It cannot be characterized model-theoretically and in certain simple cases the procedure for testing whether `\+ Goal` holds may send the system into an infinite loop. For instance, in the presence of the rule `%p :- \+ %p`, the query `?- %p` will not terminate. Prolog...
negation is the recommended type of negation for non-tabled predicates (but caution is advised).

The well-founded negation, \texttt{\textbackslash naf}, has a model-theoretic semantics and is much more satisfactory from the logical point of view. Formally, this semantics uses three-valued models where formulas can be true, false, or undefined. For instance, if we have the rule \texttt{p :- \textbackslash naf p} then the truth value of \texttt{p} is \textit{undefined}. Although the details of this semantics are somewhat involved [14], it is usually not necessary to know them, because this type of negation yields the results that the user normally expects. The implementation of the well-founded negation in XSB requires that it be applied to goals that consist entirely of tabled predicates or frames. Although \texttt{ERGO} allows \texttt{\textbackslash naf} to be applied to non-tabled goals, this may lead to unexpected results. For instance, Section 27 discusses what might happen if the negated formula is defined in terms of an update primitive.

For more information on the implementation of the negation operators in XSB, we refer the reader to the XSB manual.

Both \texttt{\textbackslash +} and \texttt{\textbackslash naf} can be used as operators inside and outside of the frames. For instance,

\begin{verbatim}
?- \textbackslash naf \%p(a).
?- \textbackslash + \%p(a).
?- \textbackslash naf X[foo->bar, bar->foo].
?- X[\textbackslash naf foo->bar, bar->foo, \textbackslash + \%p(?Y)].
\end{verbatim}

are all legal queries. Note that \texttt{\textbackslash +} applies only to non-tabled constructs, such as non-tabled \texttt{ERGO} predicates and transactional methods.

To apply negation to multiple formulas, simply enclose them in parentheses. (Parentheses are not needed for singleton formulas used in earlier examples.)

\begin{verbatim}
?- \textbackslash + (%p(a),\%q(?X)).
?- \textbackslash naf (p(a),q(?X)).
?- \textbackslash naf (?X[foo->bar], ?X[bar->foo]).
\end{verbatim}

### 19.2 Default Negation for Non-ground Subgoals

One major difference with other implementations of the well-founded default negation is that \texttt{ERGO} lets one apply it to formulas that contain variables. Normally, systems either require that the formula under \texttt{\textbackslash naf} is ground or they interpret something like \texttt{\textbackslash naf p(?X)} as meaning “not exists \texttt{?X} such that \texttt{p(?X)} is true” — the so-called \textit{Not-Exists} semantics. However, this is not the right semantics in many cases. The right semantics is usually “there exists \texttt{?X} such that \texttt{p(?X)} is \textit{not} true.” This semantics is known as the \textit{Exists-Not} semantics. Indeed, the standard convention for variables that occur in the rule body but not in the head is existential. For instance, if \texttt{?X} does not occur in the head of some rule, \texttt{p(?X)} in the body of that rule is interpreted as \texttt{\exists?X p(?X)}. Negation should
not be treated differently, i.e., $\naf p(?X)$ should be interpreted as $\exists ?X \ naf p(?X)$. Worse yet, if ?X does occur in the rule head then it is confusing and error-prone to interpret $h(?X) :- \ naf p(?X)$ as $h(?X) :- \ naf \exists ?X p(?X)$ using the Naf-Exists semantics. And without the Naf-Exists semantics, $\naf p(?X)$ has no meaning, if ?X happens to be non-ground.

ERGO takes a different approach. For body-only variables that appear under $\naf$ the semantics is Exists-Not. In addition, $\neg p$ implies $\naf p$. So,

\begin{verbatim}
\neg p({1,2}).
?- \naf p(?X).
\end{verbatim}

returns the bindings 1 and 2 for ?X. For variables that occur both under $\naf$ and in the rule head, the semantics is also standard: universal quantification that applies to the entire rule. What happens if ?X is not ground at the time of the call to $p(?X)$ (whether ?X does or does not occur in the rule head)? In that case, ERGO defers the call in the hope that ?X might become ground later. For instance, in

\begin{verbatim}
p(2).
?- \naf p(?X), ?X=1.
\end{verbatim}

the query succeeds because the call $\naf p(?X)$ will be delayed past the moment when ?X becomes ground. Finally, what happens if ?X does not become ground even after the delay? Still the Exists-Not semantics is used. If $p(?X)$ is false for all ?X (i.e., if $\naf \exists ?X p(?X)$ holds) then, in particular, $\exists \naf ?X p(?X)$ is also true (assuming an infinite number of constants) and the query succeeds with the truth value true. If $\forall ?X p(?X)$ is true then $\naf \exists ?X p(?X)$ is false. However, if none of the above cases apply then we are in a gray area and there is not enough information to tell whether $\naf \exists ?X p(?X)$ is true or false, so this subgoal succeeds with the truth value undefined. For instance, suppose that the only facts in the KB are the ones below:

\begin{verbatim}
p({1,2}).
?- \naf p(?X).
?- \naf q(?X).
\end{verbatim}

Then the first query succeeds with the truth value undefined, since $\naf \exists ?X p(?X)$ is not true. On the other hand, the second query succeeds with the truth value true. In both cases, ERGO makes an open domain assumption by refusing to commit to true or false based only on the explicitly known elements of the domain of discourse.

Finally, what if the user does want the Not-Exists semantics after all? In ERGO one must then say this explicitly and in a natural way through the use of existential quantifier:
?- \naf exists(?X)\neg p(?X).

More on the logical quantifiers is given in Section 20.

### 19.3 Non-ground Subgoals Under \+

When \+ is applied to a non-ground goal, the semantic is the standard Prolog’s one: If for some values of the variables in \texttt{Goal} the query succeeds, then \+ \texttt{Goal} is false; it is true only if for all possible substitutions for the variables in \texttt{Goal} the query is false (fails). Therefore \+ \texttt{Goal} intuitively means \(\forall \texttt{?Vars} \neg \texttt{Goal}\), where \texttt{?Vars} represents all the nonbound variables in \texttt{Goal}. However, here \(\neg\) should be understood not as classical negation but rather as a statement that \texttt{Goal} cannot be proved to be true.

### 19.4 True vs. Undefined Formulas

The fact that the well-founded semantics for negation is three-valued brings up the question of what exactly does the success or failure of a call mean. Is undefinedness covered by success or by failure? The way this is implemented in XSB is such that a call to a literal, \texttt{P}, succeeds if and only if \texttt{P} is true or undefined. Therefore, it is sometimes necessary to be able to separate true from undefined facts. In \texttt{ERGO}, this separation is accomplished with the \texttt{ERGO} primitives \texttt{true(\texttt{Goal})} and \texttt{undefined(\texttt{Goal})}. For good measure, the primitive \texttt{false(\texttt{Goal})} is also thrown in. For instance,

```prolog
a[b->c].
e[f->g] :- \naf e[f->g].

?- true{a[b->c]}. Yes

?- undefined{e[f->g]}. Yes

?- false{k[l->m]}. Yes
```
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It should be noted that the primitives \texttt{true\{...\}} and \texttt{undefined\{...\}} can be used only in top-level queries or in the rules whose heads are not mutually recursive with any of the query literals. Otherwise, the result is undefined. The expression \texttt{false\{Goal\}} is equivalent to \texttt{\naf Goal}, and can be used anywhere.

In addition, sometimes it may be necessary to to check if a succeeding query succeeds with the truth value \texttt{true} or \texttt{undefined}. (A failing query never succeeds, so there is nothing to test in that case.) To this end, \texttt{\textsc{ergo}} provides the primitive \texttt{truthvalue} which takes a variable that gets bound to the truth value of the query. For instance, suppose that the query \texttt{q(?X)} has two answers: \texttt{?X=a} is a true answer and \texttt{?X=b} is undefined (not false!). Then

\begin{verbatim}
q(a).
q(b) :- \undefined.
?- q(?X), truthvalue{?_P},
    \if ?_P == \true \then writeln(?X=true)@\io
    \else writeln(?X=undefined)@\io.
b = undefined
a = true

?X = a
?X = b - undefined
\end{verbatim}

As with \texttt{true\{...\}} and \texttt{undefined\{...\}}, the \texttt{truthvalue\{...\}} primitive can be used only in top level queries or in rules that are not mutually recursive with any of the query literals.

### 19.5 Explicit Negation

*Explicit negation* is denoted using the connective \texttt{\neg}, for instance, \texttt{\neg p}. It is a weaker form of classical negation and is quite unlike the default negation. First, explicit negation can appear both in rule heads and rule bodies. Second, unlike the default negation or Prolog negation, in order to conclude \texttt{\neg p} one must actually prove \texttt{\neg p}—not simply fail to prove \texttt{p}. In other words, establishing \texttt{\neg p} is a harder requirement than establishing \texttt{\naf p}, and \texttt{\neg p} always implies \texttt{\naf p}.

Also, unlike classical negation, the law of excluded middle does not hold for \texttt{\neg}, so both \texttt{p} and \texttt{\neg p}. In contrast, \texttt{p} and \texttt{\naf p} cannot be both true and cannot be both false—it is always the case that one is true and the other is false. Can both \texttt{p} and \texttt{\neg p} be true? The answer may surprise: yes. \texttt{\textsc{ergo}} does not check that by default because this is somewhat expensive. To tell it to check this inconsistency, two things must be done:

1. The module where these facts occur must be declared as defeasible using the
2. The facts and the rules where the above literals occur in the rule heads must be made defeasible (also see Section 40). This can be done either by giving these rules/facts the defeasible property or by assigning them explicit defeasibility tags:

For example,

```prolog
:- use_defeasibility_theory.
@@{defeasible} p.  // fact has defeasibility property
@{abc} \neg p.  // explicit defeasibility tag
?- p.
No
?- \neg p.
No
```

As you can see, in this case, EROGO will detect an inconsistency and will “defeat” the offending inferences by making both of them false. One can also find out why the various inferences were defeated—see Section 40.

The explicit negation connective, \neg, can be applied to conjunctions or disjunctions of literals. In a rule body, the idioms \neg\naf p and \neg \+ p are illegal, but \naf\neg p and \+\neg p are legal and should be informally understood as statements that p is not known to be false.

As with the default negation \naf, \neg is allowed inside the frames in front of \(\rightarrow\) and \(\Rightarrow\) and in front of Boolean (non-transactional) methods. For instance,

```
a[\neg b->c], a[\neg b =\Rightarrow c], a[\neg b], a[\neg b]
```

are allowed, but a[\neg %b], a[\neg b ->-> c], a[\neg b += c] are illegal.

At present, explicit negation works with defeasible reasoning, but it is not treated in any special way in modules that do not use defeasible reasoning. For instance, no consistency check is done to ensure that \(p\) and \(\neg p\) are not true at the same time. This is future work.

Explicit negation is fully integrated with meta-programming. For instance, the following is valid syntax:

```
?- ?X = ${a[b->c]}, \neg ?X.
```

This is equivalent to ?- \neg a[b->c]. The meta-unification and meta-decomposition operators, \sim and \=., introduced in Sections 18.1 and 18.3, are also aware of explicit negation. For instance,
?- \{\neg a[b->c]@foo\} =.. [neg_flogic(-,foo), a, b, c].
?- \neg a[b->?C]@foo - \neg ?X@?Z, \neg ?X - \neg \{\neg ?A[?B->cc]@foo\}.

The second query produces the following answer:

?C = cc
?X = \{\neg \neg a[b -> cc]@foo\}
?Z = foo
?A = a
?B = b

The answer for ?X might look a little strange, but double negation works as expected:

?- \{\neg \neg a[b -> cc]@foo\} - \{a[b -> cc]@foo\}.

Transactional HiLog literals and methods cannot be negated using \neg. For instance, the following literals are syntax errors:

\neg %p
\neg a[%p]

Similarly, \ERGO update or aggregate operations cannot be negated.

## 20 General Formulas in Rule Bodies

Unlike most other rule engines, \ERGO supports a much larger variety of formulas in the rule body. In due time we will see various if-then-else clauses, loops, etc. But the free use of logical quantifiers forall (all, each are also accepted) and exists (exist, some are also accepted) is, perhaps the most unique. In fact, the rule bodies in \ERGO can have arbitrary formulas involving quantifiers, \and, \or, \naf, and the logical implications ->, <-, <=>, <-->, ==>, <=, and <==. Here are some examples:

h1(?Z) :- \naf exists(?X)^{\neg (p(?X) --q(?X,?Z))}).
h2(?Y) :- forall(?X)^{p(?X,?Y) --q(?X)}.
h3(?V,?W) :- forall(?Y,?Z)^{\neg (p(?X)^{pp(?X,?W,?Y,?Z) , \naf qq(?X,?Y,?V,?Z)})}.
?-> forall(?X)^{p(?X)<->p(?X)}.

Other connectives, such as ==>, <=, <==, if-then-else, etc., can also be used in conjunction with the quantifiers. The definitions of all these implications are as follows:
• $\phi \rightarrow \psi$ (and $\text{if } \phi \text{ then } \psi$) is a shorthand for $\text{naf } \phi \lor \psi$.
  $\psi \leftarrow \phi$ is the same as $\phi \rightarrow \psi$, while $\phi \leftarrow \psi$ is $(\phi \rightarrow \psi \land \phi \leftarrow \psi)$.

• $\phi \Rightarrow \psi$ is a shorthand for $\text{neg } \phi \lor \psi$.
  $\psi \leftarrow \phi$ is the same as $\phi \Rightarrow \psi$, while $\phi \leftarrow \psi$ is $(\phi \Rightarrow \psi \land \phi \leftarrow \psi)$.

• $\text{if } \phi \text{ then } \psi \text{ else } \eta$ is $(\phi \rightarrow \psi \land (\text{naf } \phi) \rightarrow \eta)$.

It should be noted that it makes no sense to place non-logical operators in the scope of the quantifiers or $\text{naf}$. For instance,

?- $\text{naf load\{abc\}}$.

does not make a whole lot of sense (try it!). But some uses of quantification in conjunction with actions do make sense and are quite natural: For instance,

?- $\text{forall(?X)^\{data(?X) \rightarrow \text{writeln(?X)@io}\}}$.

will print out the contents of the predicate $\text{data/1}$.

Quantifiers in $\text{ERGO}$ are implemented through the well-known Lloyd-Topor transformation \cite{12} except that the role of negation here is played by $\text{naf}$, not $\text{neg}$. However, unlike Prolog for which the Lloyd-Topor transform was originally defined, $\text{ERGO}$ gives a logical treatment to negation of non-ground formulas. In particular, as discussed in Section 19.2, when negating non-ground subgoals the truth value may be undefined. Quantifiers and $\rightarrow$ have implicit negation in them, so, in order to know when to anticipate undefinedness, it is useful to understand what it means to have a non-ground subgoal under $\text{naf}$.

We say that a variable in the body of a rule occurs positively if it occurs in the scope of an even number of $\text{nafs}$. A variable occurs negatively if it occurs in the scope of an odd number of $\text{nafs}$. So, undefinedness can happen if some variable in the body of a rule occurs negatively and does not occur positively.

To make the above more precise, we explain how to count the $\text{nafs}$. This is not immediate because of the implicit negations mentioned earlier. So, for the purpose of counting the $\text{nafs}$, one must break each $\text{forall(Varlist)^\{\phi\} into (\text{naf exists(Varlist)^\{ (\text{naf } \phi)\})}$. Each $\phi \rightarrow \psi$ must be broken into $(\text{naf } \phi \lor \psi)$, and similarly with $\leftarrow$; $\text{if-then}$ is synonymous with $\rightarrow$; and $\leftarrow$ is a conjunction of $\rightarrow$, and $\leftarrow$. The connective $\text{if } \phi \text{ then } \psi \text{ else } \eta$ is treated for the purpose of counting $\text{nafs}$ as $\phi \land \text{naf } \psi \lor \text{naf } \eta$. Note that $\Rightarrow$ and related connectives do not involve $\text{nafs}$.
20.1 Quantification of Free and Anonymous Variables

In logic, free variables (i.e., variables that do not occur in any quantifier) do not normally make sense because it is unclear how to determine truth of a formula with such a variable. Nevertheless, non-quantified variables are widely used. In fact, languages like Prolog and SQL have no syntax for quantifiers, so one might be misled into thinking that all variables there are non-quantified. This is incorrect, however: both languages have a set of conventions by which all variables are quantified implicitly. In Prolog, for example, the convention is that all variables are implicitly quantified outside of the rule, i.e., \( \forall X, Y, Z(\text{head}(...) : \neg \text{body}(...)) \). This rule is often also stated equivalently as follows: variables that occur in the body only are quantified existentially in the body and all the rest are universal in the scope of the entire rule, i.e., \( \forall X, Y, Z(\text{head}(X, Y, Z) : \neg \exists V, W(\text{body}(X, Y, Z, V, W))) \). The situation gets muddies when negation as failure is taken into account and we will not go there right now.

In ERGO, the situation is a bit more interesting because here we have explicit quantifiers, but it is not mandatory to quantify all variables. According to the previous discussion, variables that are not quantified explicitly must be quantified implicitly according to some rules. What are these rules? The implicit quantification rules for free variables make a distinction between named variables (which includes don’t-care variables) and anonymous variables. In addition, it matters whether a free variable occurs under the scope of a \( \text{naf} \) or not:

- **Anonymous variables:**
  First, note that an anonymous variable is never explicitly quantified simply because it has no name (at least, no name the user knows about) and so one does not have anything to refer to that variable in the quantifier (something like \( \text{forall}(?) \) is not allowed because it can be highly ambiguous).

  So, the rule for such variables is that each anonymous variable that occurs in some literal, \( p(...,?,...) \) or \( \neg p(...,?,...) \), is implicitly quantified with \( \text{exists} \) immediately before that literal, i.e., \( \text{exists}(?\text{var123}) p(...,?\text{var123},...) \) or \( \text{exists}(?\text{var123}) \neg p(...,?\text{var123},...) \), where \text{var123} is some internal compiler-generated name for that anonymous variable. This existential quantifier takes precedence over \( \text{naf} \) (but not over \( \text{neg} \), as we just saw).

- **Named variables that do not occur under the \( \text{naf} \):**
  The rules for these variables are the same as in Prolog: if they occur in the head (and possibly in the body also) then they are universal with respect to the entire rule; if they occur in the body only then they are existential with respect to the body.

- **Named variables under the \( \text{naf} \):**
  This implicit quantification rule has a bit of computational flavor and is not completely declarative, which has to do with the fact that the declarative definition for \( \text{naf} \) exists for...
top-down computation essentially only for the variable-free case.
If a named variable gets grounded during the evaluation before the evaluation of \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash naf}} \) starts then it is not a variable any more and the question is moot. If it remains unbound by the time \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash naf}} \) gets computed then the variable is treated existentially outside of the scope of \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash naf}} \). In many cases, this situation leads to answers whose truth value is undefined. This because \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash ERGO}} \) quantifiers do not specify the domain for the quantified variables and for some domains such queries may be true and for some false.

20.2 The Difference Between \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslashrightarrow}}, \text{\texttt{\textrightarrow}} \) (or, \( \text{\texttt{\langle\langle}} \), and \( \text{\texttt{\textleftarrow}} \)

Note that the connectives \( \text{\texttt{\textrightarrow}}, \text{\texttt{\langle\langle}}, \) and \( \text{\texttt{\textleftarrow}} \) do not involve \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash naf}} \): they are translated using \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash neg}} \). For instance, \( \phi \texttt{\textrightarrow} \psi \) is a shorthand for \( (\text{\texttt{\textbackslash neg}} \phi) \texttt{\textor} \psi \), while \( \phi \texttt{\textleftarrow} \psi \) is a shorthand for \( (\text{\texttt{\textbackslash naf}} \phi) \texttt{\textor} \psi \) (and \texttt{\textbackslash if\textbackslash then\textbackslash else} is synonymous to \( \text{\texttt{\textrightarrow}} \)). This means that there is a significant semantic difference between these types of formulas:

- \( \phi \texttt{\textrightarrow} \psi \) is true iff: when \( \phi \) is not known to be false (i.e., when \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash neg}} \phi \) cannot be proven true) then \( \psi \) is also true.
- \( \phi \texttt{\textleftarrow} \psi \) is true iff: when \( \phi \) is true then \( \psi \) is also true.

The second statement is true in more cases. To see this, recall that \( \phi \texttt{\textrightarrow} \psi \) is \( (\text{\texttt{\textbackslash neg}} \phi) \texttt{\textor} \psi \) while \( \phi \texttt{\textleftarrow} \psi \) is \( (\text{\texttt{\textbackslash naf}} \phi) \texttt{\textor} \psi \). Note that \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash neg}} \phi \) implies \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash naf}} \phi \) i.e., the latter is true more often than the former. Therefore, \( (\text{\texttt{\textbackslash naf}} \phi) \texttt{\textor} \psi \) is true more often than \( (\text{\texttt{\textbackslash neg}} \phi) \texttt{\textor} \psi \).

Experience shows that in most cases \( \phi \texttt{\textleftarrow} \psi \) is the correct intended usage in rule bodies. If the user feels that \( \text{\texttt{\textrightarrow}} \) is needed, a careful analysis of the intended meaning based on above cases is strongly suggested.

The other important differences are syntactic: \( \phi \texttt{\textrightarrow} \psi \) can appear both in the body of a rule (i.e., on the right of \( : - \) and in the head (on the left of \( : - \)) provided that neither \( \phi \) nor \( \psi \) use the \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash naf}} \). In contrast, \( \phi \texttt{\textleftarrow} \psi \) can be used only in the body of a rule because its very definition involves \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash naf}} \).

As to \( : - \), this connective is very different from the aforementioned ones, as it is the only one that forms what we call rules. What’s on the left of \( : - \) is the head of the rule and what’s on the right is the body. Neither \( \text{\texttt{\textrightarrow}} \) nor \( \text{\texttt{\langle\langle}} \) (nor their leftward brethren \( \text{\texttt{\textleftarrow}} \) and \( \text{\texttt{\textleftarrow}} \)) form rules: they can appear only in rule bodies in \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash FLORA-2}} \) (but in \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash ERGO}} \) \( \text{\texttt{\textrightarrow}} \) can also appear in rule heads). But the main difference is that these connectives test if, say, \( \phi \texttt{\textrightarrow} \psi \) is true (false, or undefined) for some variable bindings in \( \phi \) and \( \psi \). These tests are part of the process of determining if the body of a rule is true (false or undefined). In contrast, \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash head:body}} \) tests if \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash body}} \) is true (undefined) and, if so, \texttt{\textbackslash derives} that \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash head}} \) is also true (respectively, undefined). For instance, consider the following example:
\[ p(1), q(1), r(2,1). \]
\[ w(?X) :- r(?X,?Y), (p(?Y) \rightarrow q(?Y)). \]

Here one can verify that \( p(?Y) \rightarrow q(?Y) \) is true when \( ?Y \) is bound to 1, and it so happens that \( r(?X,?Y) \) is also true for this binding if \( ?X \) is bound to 2. Then the rule on the second line of the example derives the fact \( w(2) \). It is important to understand that, in contrast, neither \( p(?Y) \rightarrow q(?Y) \) nor \( p(?Y) \Rightarrow q(?Y) \) derive anything. In \( \text{ERGO} \), \( p(?Y) \Rightarrow q(?Y) \) may also occur in rule heads, in which case it will take part in derivation of new facts. This is discussed in Section 21.

## 21 Omniformity: General Formulas in Rule Heads

\( \text{ERGO} \) greatly expands the syntactic form of the rules in \( \text{FLORA-2} \) by allowing general first-order formulas in the rule heads—a feature called omniformity. This feature is particularly important for translating English sentences into logic, but also in other kinds of reasoning about knowledge, especially when contrapositive forms of the rules are required during the reasoning.

However, since this is an advanced feature that requires a very good understanding of the meaning of such expanded formulas, omniform rules are not enabled by default: the user must request omniformity explicitly by placing the compiler directive

\[- \text{compiler\_options\{omni=on\}}.\]

More information on compiler options appears in Section 47.2. In the \( \text{ERGO} \) shell, one can also enable this feature by executing the command

\[- \text{omni\{on\}}. \quad // \text{use omni\{off\} to turn that off}.\]

In \( \text{ERGO} \) (with the omniformity feature turned on), the head formulas can be statements composed out of the following elements in a logically correct syntactic forms. That is, a head-formula is a logical formula recursively defined as follows:

- an atomic formula (frame or HiLog);
- \( \neg \text{head} \), where head is a head-formula.
- head\(_1\), head\(_2\) and head\(_1\); head\(_2\), where head\(_1\) and head\(_2\) are head formulas. As before, \( \\text{\&and} \) and \( \\text{\&or} \) can be used in place of “,” and “;”, respectively.
- \( \langle\text{head}\rangle \), where head is a head-formula.
- head\(_1\) op head\(_2\), where head\(_1\) and head\(_2\) are head formulas and op is \( \rightarrow \), \( \Leftarrow \), or \( \Leftarrow\rightarrow \).
• \(\forall\)\((VarList)^\wedge(head)\) and \(\exists\)\((VarList)^\wedge(head)\), where head is a head-formula and VarList is a comma-separated list of variables. The keyword \(\exists\) can be used in place of \(\forall\) and parentheses can be omitted, if head is an atomic formula.

Note that \(\texttt{af}\), the implications \(\texttt{-->}\), \(\texttt{<-->}\), and the rule connective \(\texttt{:-}\) are not permitted in rule heads. Likewise, builtins (e.g., \(=\), \(!=\), \(\texttt{is}\), etc.), calls to Prolog, and non-logical operators (e.g., \texttt{load}, \texttt{compile}, updates, etc.) are prohibited. This type of formulas must always go into rule bodies. Also note that formulas like

\[
\phi \iff \phi.
\]
\[
\phi \Rightarrow \phi.
\]

are syntactically classified in \(\texttt{ERGO}\) as facts, not rules, even though it is tempting to call these constructs rules because they are implications. Thus, both \(\phi\) and \(\psi\) appear in the head there (since facts can be viewed as body-less rules). In \(\texttt{ERGO}\), a rule always has the form \(\phi \texttt{:-} \neg\psi\), and only this type of constructs have rule bodies (\(\psi\) in this case). We will explain the meaning of \(\Rightarrow\) and \(\iff\) in rule heads shortly.

For clarity, consider some examples first. Suppose we know that Agent666 is either a terrorist or works for an enemy state and that either case is dangerous:

\[
\text{enemystate(Agent666) \or terrorist(Agent666).}
\]
\[
\text{dangerous(?X) :- terrorist(?X) ; enemestate(?X).}
\]

In classical logic, it would be possible to derive \texttt{dangerous(Agent666)}, but \(\texttt{ERGO}\) cannot reason by cases and it cannot reach such a conclusion just yet. However, if we also know that \(\neg\text{enemystate(Agent666)}\) is true then \(\texttt{ERGO}\) would be able to derive \texttt{terrorist(Agent666)} and thus also \texttt{dangerous(Agent666)}.

The inability of \texttt{ERGO} to reason by cases is a fundamental limitation of this class of logic languages, and working around it is difficult.\(^{10}\) For instance, even if \texttt{foo \or foo} is given, \texttt{ERGO} still cannot conclude \texttt{foo}.

For another example, let us represent the statement that U.S. Senate has exactly two senators from each state. We give two alternative representations:

\[
\text{// version 1}
\text{forall(?St)\wedge\exists(?Sn1,?Sn2)\wedge\texttt{senator(?St,\{?Sn1,?Sn2\}) \iff state(?St)).}
\]
\[
\text{// version 2}
\text{\exists(?Sn1,?Sn2)\wedge\texttt{senator(?St,\{?Sn1,?Sn2\}) :- state(?St)).}
\]

\(^{10}\) But this has very important advantages from the point of view of computational complexity the reasoning.
state(NY).
state(AL).
state(TX).

The two statements have somewhat different properties with respect omniformity—a concept discussed next.

### 21.1 Omniformity of $\leq\to$, $\to\leq$, and $\leq\to\leq$

We have already seen that the implication $\leq\to$ and its related forms are different from $\to\leftarrow$ and friends in that the latter cannot occur in the rule heads. They are also different from the rule connective $:$-- in that the body of a $:$-- can be more general and $\leq\to$-- statements are not even called rules. There are also other differences. The most interesting one is the omniformity property. Consider the following statements:

\begin{verbatim}
mother1(?X,?Y) :- female(?X), parent(?X,?Y). // (*)  
mother2(?X,?Y) $\leq\to$ female(?X), parent(?X,?Y). // (**)
female(Mary), parent(Mary,Bob).
\neg mother1(Bob,Bill), \neg mother2(Bob,Bill), parent(Bob,Bill).
\neg mother1(Sally,Peter), \neg mother2(Sally,Peter), female(Sally).
\end{verbatim}

Statement (*) lets us derive mother1(Mary,Bob), while statement (**) allows us to conclude mother2(Mary,Bob). So far the conclusions are similar. However, the facts given in the example should also let us conclude more, if we use the contrapositive statements corresponding to the implications (*) and (**). For instance, since we know that Bob is not the mother of Bill, we should be able to conclude that Bob is not a female. The catch is that the semantics of $:$-- does not sanction any contrapositive inferences, while the semantics of $\leq\to$ does. Thus, the contrapositive forms of (**)

\begin{verbatim}
\neg female(?X) $\leq\to$ parent(?X,?Y), \neg mother2(?X,?Y).
\neg parent(?X,?Y) $\leq\to$ female(?X), \neg mother2(?X,?Y).
\end{verbatim}

let us conclude \neg female(Bob) and \neg parent(Sally,Peter). This sanctioning of the contrapositive implications that are not explicitly written is called omniformity, and it is the property of $\leq\to$, $\to\leq$, and $\leq\to\leq$ when they occur in the rule heads (or facts). (Recall from Section 20.2 that in rule bodies these connectives act as tests only, no omniformity.)

For a more involved example, let us come back to the statement that every U.S. state has two senators:
// version 1
forall(?St)^exist(?Sn1,?Sn2)^senator(?St,{?Sn1,?Sn2}) <== state(?St).

// version 2
exist(?Sn1,?Sn2)^senator(?St,{?Sn1,?Sn2}) :- state(?St).
state(NY).

... Since Puerto Rico is not a state, it would not be listed among the states, but this is still not enough to conclude \texttt{\neg state(PuertoRico)}\footnote{But is enough to evaluate \texttt{\naf state(PuertoRico)} to true. However, remember that \texttt{\naf} cannot occur in rule heads, so it is not possible to derive \texttt{\naf state(PuertoRico)}.} However, if we also assert that Puerto Rico has no senators

\texttt{\neg senator(PuertoRico,?)}. \quad \texttt{\neg exist(?X)^senator(PuertoRico,?X)}. \quad \texttt{\neg exist(?X)^\neg senator(PuertoRico,?X)}. \quad \texttt{\neg exist(?X)^\neg senator(PuertoRico,?X)}.

then the version 1 implication above but not (version 2!) will sanction the derivation of \texttt{\neg state(PuertoRico)}.

Note that one has to be careful in the way the absence of senators is specified. The following might seem to be a correct way to say this and, indeed, it is a correct way to express the absence of senators in classical logic:

\texttt{\neg exist(?X,?Y)^senator(PuertoRico,{?X,?Y})}. \quad \texttt{\neg exist(?X,?Y)^\neg senator(PuertoRico,{?X,?Y})}. \quad \texttt{\neg exist(?X,?Y)^\neg senator(PuertoRico,{?X,?Y})}.

The trouble is that this is equivalent to

\texttt{forall(?X,?Y)^\neg senator(PuertoRico,?X) \or \neg senator(PuertoRico,?Y)}

and, since \texttt{\ERGO} cannot reason by cases, it cannot conclude

\texttt{forall(?X)^\neg senator(PuertoRico,?X)}

from the above. For that reason, we cannot use a contrapositive instance of

\texttt{forall(?St)^exist(?Sn1,?Sn2)^senator(?St,{?Sn1,?Sn2}) <== state(?St)}

namely,

\texttt{\neg state(PuertoRico):- forall(?Sn1,?Sn2)^\neg senator(PuertoRico,{?Sn1,?Sn2})}.

since we lack the necessary premise. Therefore, we would not be able to derive that Puerto Rico is not a state, if we the absence of senators were given using (***)
21.2 Omniformity and Builtins

As follows from the above discussion, the head-formulas that use \( \Leftarrow \) and related connectives behave very much like rules (since they are translated into sets of rules) and can be used in lieu of them in many contexts. One thing to remember, however, is that these constructs cannot contain builtins. Suppose we want to represent the statement “Customers over 65 years old are eligible to receive discounts.” We could try

\[
eligible(?X) \Leftarrow \text{customer(?X), birthYear(?X,?YoB),}  \\
      \text{\date{now->?[year->?Yr]}@\basetype,}  \\
      ?Yr-?YoB > 64.
\]

but this implication contains a builtin, which cannot occur in this kind of statements. The solution is to make a rule out of the above and put the forbidden predicates in the body:

\[
eligible(?X) \Leftarrow \text{customer(?X)}  \\
      \text{-}  \\
      \text{birthYear(?X,?YoB),}  \\
      \text{\date{now->?[year->?Yr]}@\basetype,}  \\
      ?Yr-?YoB > 64.  \\
\]

// (****)

Note that the above still enjoys the omniformity feature with respect to the head-implication. That is, if we know

\[
\text{customer(Bob), birthYear(Bob,1940).}  \\
\text{\neg eligible(Bill), birthYear(Bill,1945).}
\]

then we can use (****) to conclude \( \text{eligible(Bob)} \) and use the contrapositive form of (****) to conclude \( \text{\neg customer(Bill)} \).

22 Inheritance of Default Properties and Types

In general, inheritance means that attribute and method specifications for a class are propagated to the subclasses of that class and to the objects that are instances of that class. This section describes the extensive support for inheritance both for default values as well as for typing information.

\( \mathcal{E} \mathcal{R} \mathcal{G} \mathcal{O} \) supports two types of inheritance: structural and behavioral. Structural inheritance applies to signatures only, i.e., to class frame formulas that use the \( \Rightarrow \)-style arrows. These formulas specify the type information for classes as a whole. For instance, if \text{student::person} holds and we have the signature \text{person[|name=>string|]} then the query \text{?- student[|name=>?X|]} succeeds with \( ?X=\text{string} \).
Behavioral inheritance is much more involved. ERGO supports two versions of behavioral inheritance—monotonic and non-monotonic—and the choice can be specified on the per-module basis. In both cases, behavioral inheritance concerns class frame formulas that use the \( \rightarrow \)-style arrows or to Boolean class frames, and these formulas are inherited to subclasses and class members. The key difference is that monotonic inheritance (both structural and behavioral) is cumulative and resembles the way types are inherited in structural inheritance. In contrast, behavioral inheritance is non-monotonic in the sense that the formulas being inherited are understood as default specifications that can be overridden by the information explicitly specified for subclasses. This also implies that adding new information to subclasses may invalidate previously true facts, i.e., true (inferred) information does not necessarily grow monotonically as we add more data.

### 22.1 Introduction to Inheritance

ERGO distinguishes between information defined for a class as a whole and information defined for an individual object only. The former, class-wide information is inherited to the members of the class and to its subclasses, and is specified using the frame formulas of the form (note the vertical bars):

\[
\text{obj}[[\text{Meth}\rightarrow\text{Val}]] \\
\text{obj}[[\text{Meth}=>\text{Val}]] \\
\text{obj}[[\text{BoolProp}]] \\
\text{obj}[[\Rightarrow\text{BoolProp}]]
\]

These formulas normally occur as part of the specifications for classes. Object-specific information is given using the formulas of the form (no vertical bars!):

\[
\text{obj}[\text{Meth}\rightarrow\text{Val}] \\
\text{obj}[\text{Meth}=>\text{Val}] \\
\text{obj}[\text{BoolProp}] \\
\text{obj}[\Rightarrow\text{BoolProp}]
\]

This information is always attached to individual objects. Even if an object represents a class (and in ERGO classes are also objects), this information does not apply to the members of that class or its subclasses. For instance,

\[
\text{person}[\text{avg\_age} \rightarrow 40].
\]

does not propagate to an object such as John even if John:person is true. The property \text{avg\_age} \rightarrow 40 is likewise not inherited by the various subclasses of person, such as student or employee: it
would not make sense to propagate such information because an average age of all persons is likely to be different from the average age of students and employees, and this is why we wrote `person[avg_age->40]` and not `person[|avg_age->40|]`. Similarly, attributes that typically refer to individuals are better specified as object-level information, because normally there is nothing to inherit these attributes to. For instance,

\[\text{John}[\text{age} \rightarrow 30].\]


Class formulas typically define default properties for the objects in a class, which are inherited unless there is information to the contrary. For instance, suppose we have

```
\text{British}[|\text{nativeLanguage} \rightarrow \text{English}|].
```

If `John:British` is true, then, without evidence to the contrary, we can derive `John[\text{nativeLanguage} \rightarrow \text{English}]`. If we are also told that `Scottish::British`, i.e., Scottish people are also British, then we can derive (again, in the absence of evidence to the contrary) that `Scottish[|\text{nativeLanguage} \rightarrow \text{English}|]`.

Note that a class formula becomes an object-level formula when its information is inherited to the members of the class. For instance, if we are also told that `John:British` then `John` inherits the native language as follows: `John[\text{nativeLanguage} \rightarrow \text{English}]` (no bars! because there is nothing to inherit to from `John`). However, the inherited property remains a class formula when it is inherited to a subclass (e.g., `Scottish[|\text{nativeLanguage} \rightarrow \text{English}|]`).

Suppose now that we are told that `John` is actually a native speaker of \text{Gaelic} via the fact `John[\text{nativeLanguage} \rightarrow \text{Gaelic}]`. In that case, the explicitly given property \text{nativeLanguage} \rightarrow \text{Gaelic} overrides the default property \text{nativeLanguage} \rightarrow \text{English} and the latter is not inherited.

Overriding can happen also at the level of classes. Suppose \text{ERGO} has this pair of facts: `American[|\text{nativeLanguage} \rightarrow \text{English}|]` and `Manuel:American`. In the absence of any other information, we would have derived by inheritance that `Manuel[\text{nativeLanguage} \rightarrow \text{English}]`. But if our knowledge base also has these facts:

```
\text{PuertoRican}::\text{American}.
\text{PuertoRican}[|\text{nativeLanguage} \rightarrow \text{Spanish}|].
\text{Manuel}:\text{PuertoRican}.
```

then \text{ERGO} would discover that, since `PuertoRican` is a subclass of `American`, the property `\text{nativeLanguage} \rightarrow \text{Spanish}` is more specific to `Manuel` than `\text{nativeLanguage} \rightarrow \text{English}`, and so, by inheritance, it would derive `Manuel[\text{nativeLanguage} \rightarrow \text{Spanish}]`. Had \text{ERGO} been told that
Manuel[nativeLanguage->Portuguese], this most specific information would override that inheritance of nativeLanguage->Spanish.

The signature frame formulas are inherited similarly, but there is no overriding. For instance, suppose that we have a class language, which contains objects such as English, Spanish, Gaelic, French, etc. The knowledge base might have a fact like

\[ \text{American}\{\mid \text{nativeLanguage} \mapsto \text{language}\}. \]

which is read as a type constraint stating that, for every American, the property nativeLanguage can take only the values that are members of the class language. That is, in the above example, Manuel[nativeLanguage->Spanish] (or even Gaelic) would be ok, but Manuel[nativeLanguage->abracadabra] is not. This is because, as we said earlier, Spanish and Gaelic are known to be in class language, but it is impossible to derive abracadabra:language given our knowledge base. Section 45.2 explains how type constraints can be checked and Section 38 also explains the mechanism for automatic enforcement of such constraints.

Like defaults, type information is inheritable. For instance, suppose the knowledge base has this information:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{American}\{\mid \text{nativeLanguage} \mapsto \text{language}\}. \\
\text{PuertoRican}::\text{American}. \\
\text{Manuel}::\text{PuertoRican}.
\end{align*}
\]

\[ \text{ERGO} \text{ would then derive the following by inheritance:} \]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{PuertoRican}\{\mid \text{nativeLanguage} \mapsto \text{language}\}. \\
\text{Manuel}\{\text{nativeLanguage} \mapsto \text{language}\}.
\end{align*}
\]

Note that since Manuel is a member of PuertoRican and not a subclass, it has lost the vertical bars during the inheritance, but the class PuertoRican still has them. From here on, nothing can be inheritable from Manuel even if this object can somehow be considered as a class. For instance, suppose Manuel has two alter egos: ManuelJekyll:Manuel and ManuelHyde:Manuel. Despite the fact that now Manuel has its own class members, since Manuel[nativeLanguage->Spanish] is a property of Manuel as individual and not as a class (the missing bars tell us that!), the property nativeLanguage->Spanish is not inherited to either ManuelJekyll or ManuelHyde. Similarly, Manuel[nativeLanguage->language] specifies the type of Manuel as an individual object and so it is inherited to neither of the two alter egos.

To illustrate the no-overriding property of signature inheritance, suppose the knowledge base also has PuertoRican\{\mid nativeLanguage => latinLanguage\}. Unlike the inheritance of default values, this will not override the inheritance of the type PuertoRican\{\mid nativeLanguage}
=> `language[]`: it will still be inherited and this simply means that the actual values must lie in the intersection of the classes `language` and `latinLanguage`, which in this case is simply `latinLanguage`. However, this also means that one must be careful here. If the knowledge base had `American[nativeLanguage => germanicLanguage]` then `PuertoRican[nativeLanguage => germanicLanguage]` would also be true, but `Spanish` would not be in the intersection of the types `germanicLanguage` and `latinLanguage` (assuming our knowledge base is a good model of the real world). Such a mistake can be detected via type-checking (Section 45.2), which should prompt a revision of the way the types are specified. We should note, however, that an effect similar to inheritance overriding can be achieved via the mechanism of *defeasible reasoning* described in Section 40.

### 22.2 Monotonic Behavioral Inheritance

The default for behavioral inheritance is *non-*monotonic, so to request *monotonic* inheritance one must use the following compiler directive:

```prolog
:- setsemantics{inheritance=monotonic}.
```

This semantic can also be requested at runtime by executing the command

```prolog
?- setsemantics{inheritance=monotonic}.
```

(Of course, `?-` is to be used only when such a command appears in a file; it should be omitted on the EROG shell command line.) Here is an example of how monotonic behavioral inheritance works:

```prolog
:- setsemantics{inheritance=monotonic}.
d(?_x):a(?_x).
g(?_x)::a(?_x).
a(r)[[b(y)->c]].
g(r)[[b(y)->e]].
a(u)[[d(1)]].
g(u)[[d(2)]].
?- d(?!)[b(?X)->?Y].
```

```prolog
?I = r // inherited information
?X = y
?Y = c
```
Non-monotonic Behavioral Inheritance

Non-monotonic behavioral inheritance is the default, but sometimes one might also need or want to specify it explicitly—either for documentation or to override a differently specified inheritance at runtime. The compiler directive (that would appear in a file) is

:- setsemantics{inheritance=flogic}.

and the runtime command is

?- setsemantics{inheritance=flogic}.

The following is a  ßRGO specification for the classical Royal Elephant example:

elephant[|color=>color, color->gray|].
royal_elephant::elephant.
clyde:royal_elephant.

The first statement says that the color property of an elephant must be of type color and that
the default value is gray. The rest of the statements say that royal elephants are elephants and
that clyde is an individual elephant. The question is what is the color of clyde? The color of that
elephant is not given explicitly, but since clyde is an elephant and the default color for elephants
is gray, clyde must be gray. Thus, we can derive:

clyde[color->gray].

Observe once again that when class information is inherited by class’ individual members, the re-
sulting formula becomes object-level rather than class-level (i.e., ...[.]... instead of ...[|.|]).
On the other hand, when this information is inherited by a subclass from its superclass, then the
resulting formula is a class-level formula because it should be still applicable to the members of the
subclass and to its subclasses. For instance, if we have

circus_elephant::elephant.

then we can derive

circus_elephant[|color->gray|].

Non-monotonicity of behavioral inheritance becomes apparent when new information gets added
to the knowledge base. For instance, suppose we learn that

royal_elephant[|color->white|].

Although we have previously established that clyde is gray, this new information renders our
earlier conclusion invalid. Indeed, since clyde is a royal elephant, it must be white, while being an
elephant it must be gray. The conventional wisdom in knowledge representation is that inheritance
from more specific classes must take precedence. Thus, we must withdraw our earlier conclusion
that clyde is gray and infer that he is white:

clyde[color->white].

Nonmonotonicity also arises due to multiple inheritance. The following example, known as the
Nixon Diamond, illustrates the problem. Let us assume the following knowledge base:
republican[policy -> security].
quaker[policy -> pacifist].
Nixon:quaker.

Since Nixon is a Quaker, we can derive Nixon[policy -> pacifist] by inheritance from the second clause. Let us now assume that the following information is added:

Nixon:republican.

Now we have a conflict. There are two conflicting inheritance candidates: quaker[policy -> pacifist] and republicans[policy -> security]. In EGO, such conflicts cause previously established inheritance to be withdrawn and both policy->pacifist and policy->security become false for object Nixon. This behavior can be altered by adding additional rules and facts. For instance, adding Nixon[policy->security] would take precedence and override the inherited information. More generally, one could introduce priority over superclasses, say with a predicate hasPriority, and then add the rule

    ?Obj:?Class, ?Class[policy->?P], \naf hasPriority(?AnotherClass,?Class).

If we also had hasPriority(republican,pacifist) then inheritance from the class republican would take precedence.

Behavioral inheritance in F-logic is discussed at length in \[16, 18\]. The above non-monotonic behavior is just the tip of an iceberg. Much more difficult problems arise when inheritance interacts with regular deduction. To illustrate, consider the following:

b[m->c].
a:b.
a[m->d] :- a[m->c].

In the beginning, it seems that a[m->c] should be derived by inheritance, and so we can derive a[m->d]. Now, however, we can reason in two different ways:

1. a[m->c] was derived based on the belief that attribute m is not defined for the object a. However, once inherited, we must necessarily have a[m->{c,d}]. So, the value of attribute m is not really the one produced by inheritance. In other words, inheritance of a[m->c] negates the very premise on which the original inheritance was based, so we must give up the earlier conclusion made by inheritance as well as the subsequent inference made by the rule.
2. We did derive \( a[m\rightarrow d] \) as a result of inheritance, but that's OK — we should not really be looking back and undoing previously made inheritance inferences. Thus, the result must be \( a[m\rightarrow \{c,d\}] \).

A similar situation (with similarly conflicting conclusions) arises when the class hierarchy is not static. For instance,

\[
\begin{align*}
&d[m\rightarrow e] \\
&d::b. \\
&b[m\rightarrow c]. \\
&a::b. \\
&a[d] :- a[m\rightarrow c].
\end{align*}
\]

If we inherit \( a[m\rightarrow c] \) from \( b \) (which seems to be OK in the beginning, because nothing overrides this inheritance), then we derive \( a:d \), i.e., we get the following: \( a:d, d::b \). This means that now \( d \) seems to be negating the reason why \( a[m\rightarrow c] \) was inherited in the first place. Again, we can either undo the inheritance or adopt the principle that inheritance is never undone.

A semantics that favors the second interpretation was proposed in [9]. This approach is based on a fixpoint computation of non-monotonic behavioral inheritance. However, this semantics is unsatisfactory in many respects, including because it is procedural in nature. CRGO uses a different, more cautious semantics for inheritance, which favors the first interpretation above.

Details of this semantics are formally described in [16]. Under this semantics, \texttt{clyde} will still inherit color white, but in the other two examples \( a[m\rightarrow c] \) is not concluded. The basic intuition can be summarized as follows:

1. Method definitions in subclasses override the definitions that appear in the superclasses.

2. In case of a multiple inheritance conflict, the result of inheritance is false.

3. Inheritance from the same source through different paths is not considered a multiple inheritance conflict. For instance, in

\[
\begin{align*}
&a::c. \\
&c::e. \\
&e[m\rightarrow f]. \\
&a::d. \\
&d::e.
\end{align*}
\]

Even though we derive \( c[m\rightarrow f] \) and \( d[m\rightarrow f] \) by inheritance, these two facts can be further inherited to the object \( a \), since they came from a single source \( e \).

On the other hand, in a similar case
a:c. c[|m->f|].
a:d. d[|m->f|].

inheritance does not take place (a[|m->f|] is false), because the two inheritance candidates, c[|m->f|] and d[|m->f|], are considered to be in conflict.

Note that in the last example one might argue that even if we did inherit both facts to a, there would be no discrepancy because, in both cases, the values of the attribute m agree with each other. However, EREGO views this agreement as accidental: had one of the values changed to, say d[|m->g|], there would be a conflict.

4. At the level of methods of arity > 1, a conflict is considered to have taken place if there are two non-overridden definitions of the same method attached to two different superclasses. When deciding whether a conflict has taken place we disregard the arguments of the method. For instance, assuming that c and d are classes that are incomparable with respect to ::, the following has a multiple inheritance conflict

   a:c. c[|m(k)->f|].
   a:d. d[|m(u)->f|].

even though in one case the method m is applied to object k, while in the other it is applied to object u. On the other hand,

   a:c. c[|m(k)->f|].
   a:d. d[|m(k,k)->f|].

do not conflict, because m/1 in the first case is a different method than m/2 in the second. Similarly,

   a:c. c[|m(k)->f|].
   a:d. d[|m(u)->f|].

are not considered to be in conflict because here it is assumed that the method names are m(k) and m(u), which are distinct names. Finally,

   a:c. c[|m(k)->f|].
   c[|m(u)->f|].

is likewise not a conflict because inheritance here comes from the same class c.
In the examples that we have seen so far, path expressions queried only object-level information. To query class-level information using path expressions, ERGO uses the symbol “!”.

royal_elephant!color

means: some ?X such that royal_elephant[|color->?X|] is true. In our earlier example, ?X would be bound to white.

22.4 Inheritance of Negative Information

Certain kind of negative information can also be inherited, but inheritance goes in the opposite direction: from class members and subclasses to superclasses. The following subsections discuss this issue.

22.4.1 Negative Monotonic Behavioral Inheritance

If monotonic behavioral inheritance is requested using the setsemantics primitive, negative data frames propagate from objects to their classes as class-level frames, i.e., as frames of the form ![|...|]. Similarly, class-level data frames are propagated from subclasses to superclasses. For example, given the following data

```prolog
:- setsemantics{inheritance=monotonic}.
  obj:c1.
  c1::c2.
  obj[\neg prop->val].  // equivalently: \neg obj[prop->val]
  c1[\neg prop2->val2]]. // equivalently: \neg c1[|prop2->val2|]
  obj[\neg boolprop].  // equivalently: \neg obj[boolprop]
  c1[\neg boolprop2]]. // equivalently: \neg c1[|boolprop2|]
```

the following queries will return the answers as shown:

```prolog
?prop = prop
?val = val

?prop = prop2
?val = val2

?- c2[\neg ?boolprop]].  // equivalently: \neg c2[|?boolprop|]
```
22.4.2 Negative Structural Inheritance

Since structural inheritance is monotonic, negative structural inheritance works similarly to negative monotonic behavioral inheritance. This means that negative signatures from class members propagate to become negative class-level (i.e., \([\ldots]\)) signatures for superclasses. Similarly, class-level signatures propagate from subclasses to superclasses. For instance, given

```
?\text{boolprop} = \text{boolprop}

?\text{boolprop} = \text{boolprop2}
```

the following queries show how the negative properties propagate towards the class \text{c2}:

```
?- \text{c2}[[\lnot \text{prop} => \text{type}]]. // equivalently: \lnot \text{c2}[[\text{prop} => \text{type}]]

?\text{prop} = \text{prop}
?\text{type} = \text{type}

?\text{prop} = \text{prop2}
?\text{type} = \text{type2}

?- \text{c2}[[\lnot => \text{prop}]]. // equivalently: \lnot \text{c2}[[\text{prop}]]

?\text{prop} = \text{boolprop}

?\text{prop} = \text{boolprop2}
```

22.4.3 Negative Non-monotonic Behavioral Non-Inheritance

For non-monotonic inheritance, propagation of negative information does not occur. First, it is a logical fallacy to expect to inherit negative information like this:
c[\neg attr->1].
obj:c.
cc::c.

inferring

?- obj[\neg attr->1].
?- cc[\neg attr->1].

This does not make logical sense because the fact c[\neg attr->1] says that it is known that attr->1 is not a default for class c. One cannot logically conclude from this that it is also known that attr->1 is false for obj or that attr->1 is not a default for the subclass cc of c.

Neither does negative information propagate upwards the class hierarchy as was the case with monotonic inheritance of signatures and behavior. For instance, given

obj::c.
obj[\neg attr->1].

it does not follow that the default for attr in class c is not attr->1 (i.e., c[\neg attr->1] has no logical justification; in fact, c[\neg attr->1] could well be true).

The overall intuition for the desire to inherit negative information can nevertheless be achieved through a more powerful feature of defeasible reasoning described in Section 40. For instance, one could write a rule like


which says that, by default, obj[att->1] is known to be false if obj happens to be a member of class cl. Other statements for the members of class cl may have higher priority and override the above. For instance,

abc:cl.
@{highpriority} abc[att->1].
\overrides(highpriority,default(cl)).

This says that, for the specific member abc of class cl, att->1 is actually true because this information is specified with higher priority (highpriority) than the above default rule (default(cl)), as indicated by the priority fact \overrides(highpriority,default(cl)).

Despite all of the above, negative information does play a role in blocking inheritance. More specifically, explicit negative information specified for subclasses and class members is treated as explicit local statements that override (block) the inherited information. For instance, in
c[|attr1->{1,2}, attr2->{3,4}, attr3->{5,6}|].
c::c.
obj::c.
cc[|\neg attr1->1|]. // blocks inheritance of attr1->1 only
obj[\neg attr2->{}]. // blocks inheritance of attr2->anything
?- obj[attr1->?X]. // ?X = 2. Inheritance of attr->1 is blocked
?- cc[|attr1->?X|]. // same
?- obj[attr2->?X]. // no answers: all inheritance is blocked
?- cc[|attr2->?X|]. // ?X = 3,4: inheritance is blocked at obj, below cc
?- obj[attr3->?X]. // ?X = 5,6: inheritance occurs, nothing is blocked
?- cc[|attr3->?Y|]. // same

the explicit negative statement cc[|\neg attr1->1|] blocks the inheritance of c[|attr1->1|] down to both cc and obj. The explicit negative information obj[\neg attr2->{}] blocks the inheritance of c[|attr2->val|] down to obj, for any val. For attr3 (and for attr2 at the level of cc), however, no explicit blocking negative information exists, so the last three queries will report that data is inherited in full.

22.5 Code Inheritance

The type of behavioral inheritance defined in the previous subsection is called *value inheritance*. It originates in Artificial Intelligence, but is also found in modern mainstream object-oriented languages. For instance, it is related to inheritance of static methods in Java. With this inheritance, one would define a method for a class, e.g.,


and every member of this class will then inherit exactly the same definition of foo. Since the method definition has no way to refer to the instances on which it is invoked, this method yields the same result for all class instances. One way to look at this is that class instances do not really inherit the definition of the method. Instead, the method is invoked in the context of the class where it is defined and then the computed value is inherited down to all instances (provided that they do not override the inheritance). So, if a::cl and b::cl then a.foo(4) and b.foo(4) will return exactly the same value, 16.

A more common kind of methods is called *instance methods* in Java. In this case, the method definition refers to instances of the class in whose context the method is supposed to be invoked. The invocation takes place as follows. First, a class member inherits the *code* of the method. Then the code is executed in the context of that class member.
In F-logic this kind of inheritance is called *code inheritance* and it was studied in [17, 18]. Code inheritance is not yet supported by ERGO. However, with some loss of elegance and extra work, code inheritance can often be simulated using value inheritance. The idea consists of three steps.

1. Define the desired methods for all appropriate objects irrespective of classes. Definitions of these methods are the ones to be inherited using simulated code inheritance. These are auxiliary methods used in the process.

2. Define the attributes whose values are the names of the methods defined in step 1. These attributes will be subject to value inheritance.

3. Specify how the “real” methods in step 1 represented by the “fake” methods in step 2 are to be invoked on class instances.

We illustrate this process with the following example. First, assume the following information:

```prolog
aa:c1.
bb:c2.
c1::c2.
aa[attr1->7, attr2->2].
bb[attr1->5, attr2->4].
```

We are going to show how code is inherited from `c2` to `bb`. In an attempt to inherit the same code from `c2` to `aa`, it will be overridden by the code from `c1` and the latter (more specific code at `aa`) will be inherited by `aa`.

**Step 1: define auxiliary methods.**

```prolog
// auxiliary method foo/1 defined for every instance
// auxiliary method bar/1 defined for every instance
```

Unlike Java, the above code is not really local to any class, and this is one aspect in which simulation of code inheritance by value inheritance is inelegant.

**Step 2: define the “fake” method `meth`.**

Next we define `meth` — the method whose value inheritance will simulate the inheritance of the code of the methods `foo` and `bar`.

```prolog
c1[\dispatch(meth) -> bar!].
c2[\dispatch(meth) -> foo!].
```
Clearly, the object bb will inherit \(\text{dispatch(meth)}\rightarrow\text{foo}\) from c2, while the object aa will inherit \(\text{dispatch(meth)}\rightarrow\text{bar}\) from c1; inheritance from c2 is overridden by the more specific class c1.

Step 3: finishing up.

Next, we define how methods are to be invoked in a way that resembles code inheritance:

\[
\]

When \(?M\) is bound to a particular method, say \(\text{meth}\), and this method is invoked in the context of a class instance, \(?X\), the invocation \(?X[\text{meth(?Y)}\rightarrow?Z]\) first computes the value of the attribute \(\text{dispatch(meth)}\), which gives the name of the actual auxiliary method to be invoked. The value of the \(\text{dispatch(meth)}\) attribute (represented by the variable \(?\text{RealMeth}\)) is obtained by value inheritance. As explained above, this value is foo when \(?X\) is bound to bb and bar when \(?X = aa\). Finally, the auxiliary method whose name is obtained by value inheritance is invoked in the context of the class instance \(?X\). One can easily verify the following results:

\[
\text{ergo}> \text{aa[meth(4) \rightarrow ?Z]}.
\]

\[?Z = 8\]

\[
\text{ergo}> \text{bb[meth(4) \rightarrow ?Z]}.
\]

\[?Z = 9\]

This is exactly what would have happened in Java if aa inherited the instance method whose code is that of bar/1 and if bb inherited the code of foo/1.

23 Custom Module Semantics

\(\text{ERGO}\) enables the user to choose the desired semantics for any user module. This is done with the help of the following directive:

\[
\text{:- setsemantics\{Option1, Option2, ...\}}.
\]

The following options are allowed:

Equality: equality=none, equality=basic, where equality=none is the default.

Inheritance: inheritance=none, inheritance=flogic inheritance=monotonic, where inheritance=flogic is the default.

Tabling: tabling=reactive (default), tabling=passive, tabling=variant (default), and tabling=subsumptive.
Custom: `custom=none, custom=filename`, where `custom=none` is the default.

These options are described in more detail in the following subsections. Within each group only one choice can be present or else an error will result. It is not required that all options be present — defaults are substituted for the missing options.

The compiler directive described above determines the initial semantics used by the module in which the instruction occurs. However, it is also possible to change the semantics at run time using the `executable directive`:

```prolog
?- setsemantics{Option1, Option2, ...}.
```

Note the use of `?-` here: the symbol `:-` in the first directive designates the directives that are used at compile time only. Executable directives, on the other hand, can occur in any query or rule body. It is also possible for one module to change the semantics in another module. Typically this is needed when one module creates another. In this case the new module is created with the default semantics, and the `setsemantics` executable directive makes it possible to change the semantics of such a module.

The following options are available only with the executable version of `setsemantics`, while the previously mentioned options can be used both at compile and run time.

**Subclassing:** `subclassing=strict, subclassing=nonstrict`, with `strict` being the default.

**Class expressions:** `class_expressions=on, class_expressions=none`; default: `none`.

Here is an example:

```prolog
?- setsemantics{equality=basic, custom='a/b/c'}.  
```

The order of the options in the directive does not matter.

**Changing module semantics — precautions.** Changing module semantics on the fly at run-time is a rather drastic operation. It is therefore not recommended to do this in the body of a rule, especially if the rule defines a tabled HiLog predicate or a frame. The only safe way to execute `setsemantics` is in a query at the top level. For instance,

```prolog
?- setsemantics{...}.  
```
23.1 Equality Maintenance

User-defined equality. \(ERGO\) users can define equality \emph{explicitly} using the predicate \(=:=\). For instance,

\begin{verbatim}
John:=:Batman.
\end{verbatim}

Once two oids are established to be equal with respect to \(=:=\), whatever is true of one object is also true of the other. Note that \(=:=\) is different from the built-in =. The latter is a predefined primitive, which cannot occur in facts or in rule heads. Since = is understood as unification, ground terms can be \(=\)-equal only if they are identical. Thus, \(a=a\) is always true and \(a=b\) is always false. In contrast, the user can assert a fact such as \(a=:b\), and from then on the object \(a\) and the object \(b\) are considered the same (modulo the equality maintenance level, which is described below).

Equality maintenance levels. Once an equality between terms is derived, this information may need to be propagated to all F-logic structures, including the subclass hierarchy, the ISA hierarchy, etc. For instance, if \(x\) and \(y\) are equal, then so must be \(f(x)\) and \(f(y)\). If \(x:a\) has been previously derived then we should now be able to derive \(y:a\), etc. Although equality is a powerful feature, its maintenance can slow down the execution quite significantly. In order to be able to eat the cake and have it at the same time, \(ERGO\) allows the user to control how equality is handled, by providing the following three compiler directives:

\begin{verbatim}
:- setsemantics{equality=none}. // default
:- setsemantics{equality=basic}.
\end{verbatim}

The first directive, \texttt{setsemantics\{equality=none\}}, does not maintain any equality and \(=:=\) is just a symmetric transitive relation that includes the identity. However, the congruence properties of equality are not supported (for instance, \(p(a)\) and \(a=:b\) do not imply \(p(b)\)). The directive \texttt{setsemantics\{equality=basic\}} guarantees that \(=:=\) obeys the usual rules for equality, i.e., transitivity, reflexivity, symmetry, and (limited) congruence.

If a \(ERGO\) module does not define facts of the form \(a=:b\), which involve the equality predicate \(=:=\), then the default equality maintenance level is \texttt{none}. If the knowledge base does have such facts, then the default equality maintenance level is \texttt{basic}, because it is assumed that the use of \(=:=\) in the source is not accidental. In any case, the explicit \texttt{equality=}... option overrides the default.
Locality of equality. Equality in $\mathcal{ERGO}$ is always local to the module in which it is derived. For example, if $a::=b$ is derived by the rules in module $\text{foo}$ then the query

$$?- (a::=b)@\text{foo}.$$ 

will succeed, but the query

$$?- (a::=b)@\text{bar}.$$ 

will fail (unless, of course, $a::=b$ is also derived by the rules in module $\text{bar}$).

Since equality information is local to each module, the directives for setting the equality level affect only the particular user modules in which they are included. Thus, equality can be treated differently in different modules, which allows the knowledge engineer to compartmentalize the performance problem associated with equality and, if used judiciously, can lead to significant gains in performance.

Run-time changes to the equality maintenance level. In $\mathcal{ERGO}$, the desired level of equality maintenance can also be changed at run time by executing a goal such as

$$?- \text{setsemantics\{equality=basic\}}.$$ 

Furthermore, $\mathcal{ERGO}$ allows one user module to set, at run time, the level of equality maintenance in another user module:

$$?- \text{setsemantics\{equality=basic\}@foobar}.$$ 

This might be useful for dynamic modules, i.e., modules that are not associated with any files and whose content is generated completely dynamically. (See Section 27.)

Using the preprocessor to avoid the need for equality maintenance. One final bit of advice regarding equality: In many cases, knowledge engineers tend to use equality as an aliasing technique for long messages, numbers, etc. In this case, we recommend the use of preprocessor commands, which achieve the same result without loss of performance. For instance,

```c
#define YAHOO 'http://yahoo.com'

?- YAHOO[fetch -> ?X].
```

Assuming that $\text{fetch}$ is a method that applies to strings that represent Web sites and that it fetches the corresponding Web pages, the above will fetch the page at the Yahoo site, because the $\mathcal{ERGO}$ compiler will replace YAHOO with the corresponding string that represents a URL.
Limitations of equality maintenance in ERGO. The implementation of equality in ERGO supports only a limited version of the congruence axiom due to the overhead associated with such an implementation. A congruence axiom states that if $\alpha = \beta$ then $\beta$ can be substituted for any occurrence of $\alpha$ in any term. For instance, $f(x,\alpha) = f(x,\beta)$. In ERGO, however, the query

$$a :=: b.$$  
$$?- g(a) :=: g(b).$$

will fail. However, equal terms can be substituted for the arguments of frames and HiLog predicates. For instance, the queries

$$a :=: b.$$  
$$a[f->c].$$  
$$p(a,c).$$  
$$?- b[f->c].$$  
$$?- p(b,c).$$

will succeed.

23.2 Choosing a Semantics for Inheritance

As mentioned earlier, the setsemantics directive accepts three options: inheritance=none, inheritance=flogic, and inheritance=monotonic. The default is flogic; this type of inheritance is described in Section 22.

With inheritance=none, behavioral inheritance is turned off in the corresponding module. This can significantly improve performance in cases when inheritance is not needed.

Note that inheritance=none does not turn off inheritance of signatures. Inheritance of signatures can be used for run-time type checking and it makes no good sense to disable it. Preserving inheritance of signatures does not affect the performance either.

Monotonic inheritance inheritance=monotonic is also sometimes appropriate—mostly in situations when information from superclasses is to be propagated and accumulated by subclasses and members without overriding. This type of inheritance is also significantly cheaper resource-wise than the F-logic inheritance, although it is more expensive than turning inheritance off completely.

23.3 Choosing a Semantics for the Subclass Relationship

The default semantics for the subclass relationship :: in ERGO is strict. This means that there can be no loops in the subclass hierarchy. If ERGO detects a cycle at run time, it issues an error. The user can change this semantics by executing the runtime directive
?- setsemantics{subclassing=nonstrict}.

Note that the above sets the nonstrict semantics for subclassing in the current module only. To change back to the strict semantics, one can execute

?- setsemantics{subclassing=strict}.

and to change the semantics in a different module one can execute

?- setsemantics{subclassing=nonstrict}@foo.

One can find out the subclassing semantics in effect in the current module by executing the following query:

?- semantics{subclassing=?Sem}.

Note: the subclassing option is not available as a static setsemantics directive (i.e., it works only with “?-” and not with “:–”).

23.4 Choosing a Semantics for Tabling

The semantics for tabling can be specified along two different dimensions: reactivity and identification. The options for reactivity are tabling=reactive and tabling=passive, which is explained in Section 27.3. The options for the identification dimension are tabling=variant (the default) and tabling=subsumptive. Subsumptive tabling currently works only in conjunction with passive tabling, and it is experimental at present. In some cases, subsumptive tabling may significantly speed up computation time and save memory.

23.5 Class Expressions

ERGO defines a number of set-theoretic operations on classes. For instance, (a, b) is the intersection class, (a ; b) is the union class, and (a − b) is the difference class. More precisely, (a, b) is the maximal subclass of a and b in the class hierarchy, and its extension is precisely the intersection of the extensions of a and b. The class (a ; b) is the smallest superclass of a and b. The class (a − b) is the maximal subclass of a with extension that contains all the elements of a that are not in the extension of b.

The class expressions feature is off by default and must be enabled at runtime with
?- setsemantics{class_expressions=on}.
?- setsemantics{class_expressions=on}@somemodule.

It can also be disabled via

?- setsemantics{class_expressions=none}.
?- setsemantics{class_expressions=none}@somemodule.

Suppose the following information is given:

a, b, c in class1
c in class2
e in class3

Then \((\text{class1} - \text{class2}); \text{class3}\) has the extension of \(a, b, e\).

We call the above combinations of types \textbf{class expressions}. Type expressions can occur in signature expressions as shown below:

\[
\text{cl[\text{attr} => ((c1 - c2) ; c3)].}
\]
\[
\text{cl[\text{attr} => ((c1,c2) ; c3)].}
\]

In the first case, the type is specified for \(c1\) as an individual object only. The second statement is about \(c1\) as a \textit{class}, so this type specification is inherited by each member of the class \(c1\) and each subclass.

\textit{ERGO} also defines a number of subclass relationships among class expressions as follows.

1. If \(c::c1\) and \(c::c2\) then \(c::(c1,c2)\), i.e., \((c1,c2)\) is the greatest lower bound of \(c1\) and \(c2\) in the class hierarchy.

2. If \(c1::c\) and \(c2::c\) then \((c1;c2)::c\), i.e., \((c1;c2)\) is the lowest upper bound of \(c1\) and \(c2\) in the class hierarchy.

3. Any class, \(c\), is considered a superclass of \((c,?_-)\) and \((?_-,c)\). In particular, \((c,c)::c\). At present, \textit{ERGO} does not enforce the equality \(c::=(c,c)\).

4. Any class, \(c\), is considered a subclass of \((c,?_-)\) and \((?_-;c)\). In particular, \(c::(c;c)\). At present, \textit{ERGO} does not enforce the equality \(c::=(c;c)\).

5. Any class, \(c\), is considered a superclass of \(c-d\) for any class \(d\).
Unfortunately, these subclass relationships may adversely affect the performance of user knowledge bases, and ERGO provides an optimization option that allows the user to disable these relationships for situations that do not need them, which is why this feature is off, by default.

**Note:** Type expressions introduce a potential for infinite answers for seemingly innocuous queries and so this feature is disabled by default, as explained earlier in this section. For instance, suppose that \( a : c \) is true. Then also \( a : (c,c), a : (c;c), a : (c,(c,c)), a : (c;(c;c)) \), etc. So, the query
\[
?- a : ?X.
\]
will not terminate. To mitigate this problem, when class expressions are involved ERGO guarantees to provide sound answers to queries about class membership and subclasses only when the arguments are ground; it does not guarantee that all class expressions will be returned to queries that involve open calls to “::” and “:”.

### 23.6 Ad Hoc Custom Semantics

The `setsemantics` directive allows the user to include additional axioms that define the semantics of a particular module. These axioms should be stored in a file and included into the module using the compiler or executable directive

\[
:- setsemantics\{custom=filename\}.
\]

However, the default is `custom=none`.\(^{12}\) To take advantage of this feature, the user must write the axioms using the same API that is used for ERGO trailers, which are located in the `closure` directory of the distribution. This API will be described at a later date.

### 23.7 Querying the Module Semantics

In addition to the ability to change the semantics of a module, ERGO also lets the user *query* the semantics used by any given module through the `semantics` primitive. The syntax is similar to the `setsemantics` directive:

\[
?- semantics\{ Option1, Option2, \ldots \}.
\]
\[
?- semantics\{ Option1, Option2, \ldots \}@modulename.
\]

The options are the same as in the case of the `setsemantics` directive, but variables are allowed in place of the specific semantic choices, *e.g.*, `equality=?X`. The options unify with the current semantic settings in the module, so queries such as

\(^{12}\) Which implies that if the file has the name `none` then a full path name should be specified — just “none” implies no custom file.
?- semantics{equality=?X, custom=none}.
?- semantics{inheritance=flogic, equality=?X, custom=?Y}@foo.

are allowed. The order of the options in a semantics-query does not matter.

The @module part in the semantics primitive must be bound to a module name at the time the query is executed. However, it is still possible to determine which modules have a given combination of semantic options by examining every loaded module via the isloaded{...} primitive and then posing the desired semantics{...} query.

## 24 ERGO and Tabling

### 24.1 Tabling in a Nutshell

Tabling is a fundamental deduction technique that augments query evaluation with a mechanism that remembers previously inferred conclusions. The result is a very efficient deductive engine.

ERGO automatically tables frames and HiLog predicates, but allows the user to have non-tabled predicates as well. Such predicates are called transactional and are mostly used for side-effects, such as writing to or reading from files (or to/from the screen) and to insert and delete facts and rules. To indicate that a HiLog literal is non-tabled, it must be preceded with the “%” sign.

For instance, in the following rules, tc/2 is tabled but %edge/2 is not tabled.

```prolog
tc(X,Y) :- %edge(?X,?Y).
tc(X,Y) :- %edge(?X,?Y), tc(?Y,?Z).
```

A predicate with the % prefix is logically unrelated to the predicate without the % prefix. Thus, p(a)(b) being true does not imply anything about %p(a)(b), and vice versa. However, ERGO issues a warning in case of such a double-use.

Symbols that are prefixed with the “%” sign can appear only as predicate formulas, predicate names, Boolean method names, or variables. A variable prefixed with “%” cannot be a stand-alone formula, unless it is associated with a module specification. The following occurrences of “%” are legal

```prolog
?- insert{%p(a)}, %?(?X). // %? is a variable ranging over non-tabled predicate names
?- a[%b(c)], a[%?Y]. // %b and %?Y are transactional Boolean methods
?- %?X@?M ~ %p(a). // %p - a non-tabled predicate
```
but the following are not:

?- p(%a).             // %a appears as a term, not a formula
?- ?X = %a.            // %a appears as a term, not a formula
?- %?X = a.            // %?X appears as a term, not a formula
?- a[%b(c)->d].         // %b is not a Boolean method
?- %?X ~ %p(a).         // %?X as a stand-alone formula

The first formula is illegal because %a occurs as a term and not as a predicate (it can be made legal by reifying the argument: p($%a$)). In the second and third formulas %a and %?X also appear as unreified arguments. The fourth formula is illegal because %b(c) is not a Boolean method. The last one is illegal because %?X can not be a stand-alone formula (it can be made legal by associating a module with it).

Occurrences of variables that are prefixed with % are treated specially. First, it should be kept in mind that %?X and ?X represent the same variable. If ?X is already bound to something then both of them mean the same thing. However, ?X itself can range not only over predicates but also terms, conjunctions/disjunctions of predicates, and even rules. In contrast, %?X with module specification can be bound only to non-tabled formulas and ?X with module specification can be bound only to tabled formulas. Thus error messages will be issued for the following two queries:

?- ?X ~ p(a), %?X@?M ~ p(a).
?- ?X ~ a[%b], ?X@?M ~ a[%b].

The following query fails because %?X and ?X represent the same variable: the first conjunct determines the binding for ?X, and this binding does not match the expression on the right side of ~ in the second conjunct.

?- %?X@?M ~ %p(a), ?X ~ p(a).

In the query, ?X is bound to the non-tabled formula %p(a), and this does not meta-unify with the tabled formula p(a).

When a bound variable occurs with an explicit module specification, then the following rules apply:

- If the idiom ?X@module is used, ?X can be bound only to a tabled predicate, a tabled molecular formula, or a HiLog term (not a predicate). Otherwise, an error is issued. If ?X is already bound to a tabled predicate or molecular formula, then the explicit module specification (@module) is discarded. When ?X is bound to a HiLog term, e.g., p(a)(?Z), ?X@module represents the tabled predicate p(a)(?Z)@module.
• If the idiom $\%?X@\text{module}$ is used, $?X$ can be bound to only a non-tabled predicate, a non-tabled molecular formula, or a HiLog term. If $?X$ is already bound to a non-tabled predicate or molecular formula, the explicit module specification is discarded, as before. If $?X$ is bound to a HiLog term, then $\%?X@\text{module}$ represents the non-tabled predicate $p(a)(?Z)@\text{module}$.

Due to these rules, the first query below succeeds, while the second fails and the third causes an error.

?- $?X = p(a), \%?$X@?M - \%p(a), ?X@?N - p(a)@foo.
?- $?X = p(a), ?X@?M - p(a)@foo.
?- $?X = p(a), $\%?$X@?M - \%p(a)@foo.

The first query succeeds because $?X$ is bound to the term $p(a)$, which $\%?$X@?M promotes to a non-tabled predicate with a yet-to-be-determined module. The meta-unification that follows then binds $?M$ to main. Similarly $?X@?N$ promotes the term $p(a)$ to a tabled predicate with a yet-to-be-determined module, and meta-unification binds $?N$ to foo. The second query fails because $?X$ is already bound to a tabled predicate and therefore $?X@?M$ represents $p(a)@\text{main}$, which does not meta-unify with $p(a)@\text{foo}$. The third query gives an error because $?X$ is bound to a tabled predicate, while $\%?$X@?M$ expects a non-tabled predicate or a HiLog term.

When $?X$ and $\%?$X occur with explicit module specifications and are unbound then the occurrences of $\%?$X indicate that $?X$ is expected to be bound to predicate names, Boolean method names, or predicate/molecular formulas that correspond only to non-tabled methods or predicates. Likewise, an occurrence of an unbound $?X$ indicates that $?X$ is expected to be bound to predicate names or predicate/molecular formulas that correspond to tabled methods or predicates.

**Transactional ($%$-prefixed) literals and meta-programming.** In meta-unifications, update operations and the clause construct, variables that are prefixed with a “$\%$” to indicate non-tabled occurrences must have explicit module specifications. An unprefix variable without a module specification, such as $?X$, can meta-unify with both tabled and non-tabled predicates. However, when an explicit module specification is given, such as in $?X@\text{main}$, unprefix variables can be bound only to tabled predicates. For example, all of the following queries succeed without errors.

?- $?X - \%p(a).
?- $?X - p(a).
?- $?X = a[b->c]@\text{foo}.
?- $?X - a[\%b]@?M.
?- $?X@?M - p(a).
?- \%?$X@\text{foo} - a[\%b]@?M.
In the context of update operations, ERGO uses the same rules for variables of the form %?X and ?X. Therefore, the following operations will succeed:

?- insert{p(a),%q(b)}. // Yes
?- delete{?X@\@}. // Yes, with ?X bound ${p(a)}
?- delete{?X@\@}. // Yes, with ?X bound ${%q(b)}
?- insert{p(a),%q(b)}. // Yes
?- delete{?X}. // Yes, ?X bound to ${p(a)} or ${%q(b)}

These rules also apply to queries issued against rule bases using the clause{...} primitive (described in Section 29) or to deletion of rules with the deleterule primitive.

?- insertrule{p(?X) :- q(?X)}.  
?- insertrule{%t(?X) :- %r(?X)}.  
?- insertrule{pp(?X) :- q(?X), %r(?X)}.  
?- clause{?X,?Y}. // all three inserted rules above would be retrieved  
?- clause{?X@\@,?Y}. // ?X = %t(?_var) and ?Y = %r(?_var)  
?- clause{?X@\@,?Y@\@}. // ?X = p(?_var) and ?Y = q(?_var)  
?- clause{?X@\@,?Y}. // the first and the third rules would be retrieved

24.2 Transactional Methods

Queries can have unintended effects when used in conjunction with predicates that have non-logical “side effects” (e.g., writing or reading to/from a file or a console) and queries that change the state of the underlying knowledge base. If a tabled construct (a HiLog predicate or an F-logic frame) has a side effect, the first time the predicate is called the side effect is performed. However, the second time the call simply returns success or failure depending on the outcome of the first call, since the answer is simply looked up in a table of previous answers. Indeed, tabled constructs represent purely logical statements that are not supposed to have side effects, so there is no reason to re-execute them. Thus, if a ERGO construct is intended to perform a side effect each time it is called, it will not operate correctly.

Object-oriented programs often rely on methods that produce side effects or make updates. In ERGO we call such methods transactional. Because by default ERGO tables everything that looks like a frame, these transactional methods are potentially subject to the aforesaid problem.

To sidestep this issue, ERGO introduces a new syntax to identify transactional methods — by allowing the “%” sign in front of a transactional method. For instance, the following rule defines an output method that, for every object, writes out its oid:

\( ?O[\%output] := write(O)@\prolog \)
Like boolean methods, transactional methods can take arguments, but do not return any values. The only difference is that transactional methods are not tabled, while boolean methods are.

**Transactional signatures.** Transactional methods can have signatures like other kinds of methods, which are specified as follows:

- `Obj[=>%Meth]`
- `Class[|=>%Meth]`

**ERGO** does not support transactional methods specified as defaults at the class level. However, as seen from the second statement above, class-level signatures for transactional methods are supported.

### 24.3 Re-examining Query Results: The `peek{...}` primitive

**ERGO** also provides a way to browse the results of the previous tabled (non-transactional) queries, called *peeking*, and is provided via a special primitive

```
peek{frame-or-predicate-goal}
```

The result is that the results of the query are returned without re-executing the query.

At first glance, it may seem that this is no different from tabling, which also returns the results without re-executing, but there is an important and subtle difference: `peek{Goal}` returns the answers to all *previously executed* queries that unify with `Goal`. There could be several such previous queries or none. If none, then the above primitive returns no answers; if several, the primitive returns the answers to all those queries. In contrast, if the query were just `Goal` then, if this exact query was asked before then its answers will be returned without re-evaluation. The answers to other queries that unify with `Goal` will not be returned. If `Goal` was not asked before then it will be evaluated and the results returned.

To illustrate, consider the following simple example:

```
p(1,a), p(1,b).
p(2,c), p(2,d).
p(3,e), p(3,f).
?- p(1,?), p(2,?).
```
If we now ask the query `peek{p(?X,?Y)}` then we get the following four answers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>?X</th>
<th>?Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that ?X=3 and ?Y=e, ?Y=f are not returned because the query `p(3,?Y)` was never asked. In contrast, the query `p(?X,?Y)` will return all six answers (and it will be evaluated, as it is not a `peek`-query) and after asking `p(?X,?Y)` the subsequent query `peek{p(?X,?Y)}` will also return all six answers (because it will pick up the answers produced by `p(?X,?Y)`).

Another important use of the `peek` primitive is that it enables one to look into the partially computed query results during pauses in the computation. For instance, start `ERGO` and run `demo{owl_benchmark}` at the prompt. After a few seconds, type `Ctrl-C` to pause the execution and at the prompt ask the query `?X::?Y`. Since non-transactional queries are currently not allowed during these pauses (see Section 45.8), one would see an error message like this:

```plaintext
++Abort[Ergo]> you are trying to query or modify the knowledge base while
a previous command is paused; only informational queries regarding
the system runtime state are permitted at this point
```

However, `peek{?X::?Y}` is allowed, and it will give the answers to the query that have been computed so far.

### 24.4 Operational Semantics of ERGO

Although `ERGO` is a declarative language, it provides primitives, such as input/output, certain types of updates, cuts, etc., which have no logical meaning. In such cases, it is important to have an idea of the operational semantics of `ERGO`. This operational semantics is essentially the same as in XSB and when no tabled predicates or frames are involved, the behavior is the same as in Prolog. However, when tabled HiLog predicates or frames (other than transactional methods) are used, the knowledge engineer must have some understanding of the way XSB evaluates tabled predicates.
Unlike Prolog, which computes answers one-at-a-time, ERGO computes answers to the entire clique of inter-dependent predicates are computed before the computation proceeds to the next literal in a rule body. The following little example illustrates the difference:

```
a:b.
d:b.
c:b.

%q(?X,?Y) :- ?X:?Y, writeln(?X)@\prolog.

?- ?X[foo(?Y)], writeln(done)@\prolog.
?- %q(?X,?Y), writeln(done)@\prolog.
```

The two queries are essentially the same. The first is a frame and so it is implemented internally as a tabled XSB predicate. The second query is implemented as a non-tabled predicate. Thus, despite the fact that the two queries are logically equivalent, they are not operationally equivalent. Indeed, a simple experiment shows that the answers to the above two queries are produced in different orders (as seen by the order of execution of the print statements). In the first query, ?X[foo(?Y)] is evaluated completely before proceeding to writeln(done)@\prolog and thus the executions of writeln(?X)@\prolog are grouped together. In the second case, executions of writeln(?X)@\prolog and writeln(done)@\prolog alternate, because q/2 is not tabled and thus its evaluation follows the usual Prolog semantics.

On the other hand, if we have

```
q(?X,?Y) :- ?X:?Y, writeln(?X)@\prolog.

?- ?X[foo(?Y)], writeln(done)@\prolog.
?- q(?X,?Y), writeln(done)@\prolog.
```

then the two queries will behave the same, as both q/2 and ?X[foo(?Y)] would then be implemented internally as tabled predicates. Likewise, if we replace foo with %foo then the corresponding frame would be represented internally as a non-tabled predicate. Thus, the two queries, below,

```
%q(?X,?Y) :- ?X:?Y, writeln(?X)@\prolog.

?- %?X[%foo(?Y)], writeln(done)@\prolog.
?- %q(?X,?Y), writeln(done)@\prolog.
```
will produce the same result where \( a, b, c \) and \texttt{done} alternate in the output.

### 24.5 Tabling and Performance

It is important to keep in mind that Prolog does not reorder frames and predicates during joins. Instead, all joins are performed left-to-right. Thus, rules and queries must be written in such a way as to ensure that smaller predicates and classes appear early on in the join. Also, even though XSB tables the results obtained from previous queries, the current tabling engine has several limitations. In particular, when a new query comes in, XSB tries to determine if this query is “similar” to one that already has been answered (or is in the process of being evaluated). Unfortunately, the default notion of similarity used by XSB is fairly weak, and many unnecessary recomputations might result. XSB has partial support for a novel technique called \textit{subsumptive tabling}, and it is known that subsumptive tabling can speed up certain queries by an order of magnitude. However, XSB’s implementation of subsumptive tabling does not support active tabling, which prevents most of the uses of this kind of tabling in \texttt{ERGO}.

### 24.6 Cuts

No discussion of a logic programming language is complete without a few words about the infamous Prolog cut (!). Although Prolog’s cut has been (mostly rightfully) excommunicated as far as Database Query Languages are concerned, it is sometimes indispensable when doing “real work”, like pretty-printing \texttt{ERGO} knowledge bases or implementing a pattern matching algorithm. To facilitate this kind of tasks, \texttt{ERGO} lets the user use Prolog-like cuts.

A Prolog cut is akin to the switch/case-statements in languages like C or Java, but the full explanation of cuts is quite involved and we leave it out, assuming the reader is familiar with this concept.

\textbf{Cuts across tables.} The current implementation of XSB has a limitation that Prolog cuts cannot “cut tabled predicates.” If you get an error message saying something about cutting across tables — you know that you have cut too much!

The basic rule that can keep you out of trouble is: do not put a cut in the body of a rule \textit{after} any frame or tabled HiLog predicate. However, it is OK to put a cut before any frame. It is even OK to have a cut in the body of a rule that \textit{defines} a frame (again, provided that the body has no frame to the left of that cut). If you need to use cuts, plan on using transactional methods or non-tabled predicates.

The Prolog cut operator (!) in rule bodies may cause problems because XSB does not allow the cut to appear in the middle of a computation of a tabled predicate. For instance,
will not cause problems, but


will likely result in a runtime error. The reason is that in the first case the frame ?X[%foo(?Y)] is implemented using a non-tabled predicate, so by the time the evaluation reaches the cut, both ?Z[moo->?W] and ?W:?X will be evaluated completely and their tables will be marked as “complete.” In contrast, in the second example, ?X[foo->?Y] is implemented as a tabled predicate, which is interdependent with the predicates that are used to implement ?Z[moo->?W] and ?W:?X. Thus, the cut would occur in the middle of the computation of the tabled predicate ?X[foo->?Y] and an error will result.

In a future release, XSB might implement a different tabling schema. While cutting across tables will still be prohibited, it will provide an alternative mechanism to achieve many of the goals a cut is currently used for.

Cuts and facts. Prolog programmers are accustomed to treat facts as rules, and so Prolog programs with cuts heavily rely on the order of the rules. For instance, in

\begin{verbatim}
   p(X,Y) :- q(X), !, r(X,Y).
   p(3,4).
   q(1).
   r(1,2).
\end{verbatim}

it is expected that the open query p(X,Y) will succeed from the first rule and will return p(1,2). The query will not match the fact p(3,4) due to the cut because that fact comes after the first rule.

This kind of reasoning will not work in ERGO because facts are stored in an internal database in an unordered fashion and one cannot know when they are going to be matched against the query. So, in ERGO an open call p(?X,?Y) would return both p(1,2) and p(3,4). A user who wants to rely on rule ordering should convert the relevant facts into rules, as follows:

\begin{verbatim}
   p(?X,?Y) :- q(?X), !, r(?X,?Y).
   p(3,4) :- \true.  // true.
   q(1).
   r(1,2).
\end{verbatim}

In that case, p(?X,?Y) will return only one answer.
25 User Defined Functions

User-defined functions (abbr., *UDF*) are a syntactic extension that permits the users to enjoy certain aspects of functional programming in the framework of a logic-based language.

25.1 Syntax

To define a UDF in ERGO, one uses the following syntax:

\[
\text{\texttt{\textbackslash udf foo(t1,...,tn) := Expr \textbackslash if Body.}}
\]

*Expr* is a term and *Body* can be any formula that can be used as a rule body. The “\texttt{\textbackslash if Body}” part is optional. The arguments of the UDF *foo* are terms, which usually are distinct variables.

*Expr* and *Body* can contain occurrences of other UDFs, but those UDFs must be defined previously. At first, this suggests that mutually-recursive UDFs cannot be defined. However, this is not the case, as will be explained shortly.

Instead of “if”, ERGO also allows the use of the rule connective :-:

\[
\text{\texttt{\textbackslash udf foo(t1,...,tn) := Expr :- Body.}}
\]

**Example.** The following simple example defines *father/1* as a function.

\[
\text{\texttt{\textbackslash udf father(?x):=?y \textbackslash if father(?x,?y).}}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{father(mary,tom).} \\
\text{father(john,sam).}
\end{align*}
\]

So, instead of writing *father*(John,?y) and then using ?y one can simply write *father*(?John):

\[
?- \text{?y=father(?x).}
\]

will return

\[
\begin{align*}
?x=mary \\
?y=Tom \\
?x=john \\
?y=sam
\end{align*}
\]
The query

? - writeln(father(mary))@\io.

will output

tom

**Mutual recursion in UDF definitions.** It was mentioned that any UDF that occur in a definition of another UDF must be defined previously. However, this does not mean that mutually recursive UDFs cannot be defined: one should just exercise care.

First, we should make it clear that recursive UDFs by themselves do not pose problems and can be used freely. For example, in

\[ \text{\texttt{ufd foo(...)} := Expr \ if \ Body.} \]

A more complex situation arises when we have mutual recursion, as in

\[ \text{\texttt{ufd foo(...)} := Expr-cannot-contain-bar \ if \ Body-contains-bar.} \]
\[ \text{\texttt{ufd bar(...)} := Expr-can-contain-foo \ if \ Body-might-contain-foo.} \]

This is not allowed, because `bar` is used in `Body-contains-bar` before it was defined. But there is a simple workaround: we can introduce a temporary predicate as follows:

\[ \text{\texttt{ufd foo(...)} := Expr-cannot-contain-bar \ if \ tempfoo(...).} \]
\[ \text{\texttt{ufd bar(...)} := Expr-can-contain-foo \ if \ Body-can-contain-foo.} \]
\[ \text{\texttt{tempfoo(...)} := Body-contains-bar.} \]

In this latter case, all uses of UDFs are defined previously, and UDFs are still mutually recursive. If `foo` has more than one `\texttt{ufd}`-clause and one of the clauses does not involve `bar` then one does not even need to introduce temporary predicates. For instance, the following is legal:

\[ \text{\texttt{ufd foo(...)} := Expr-contains-no-bar \ if \ Body-contains-no-bar.} \]
\[ \text{\texttt{ufd bar(...)} := Expr-can-contain-foo \ if \ Body-can-contain-foo.} \]
\[ \text{\texttt{ufd foo(...)} := Expr-can-contain-bar \ if \ Body-can-contain-bar.} \]

Here the first clause declares `foo` as a UDF, so the compiler is able to handle `foo` correctly in the second clause despite the fact that `foo` has not been fully defined yet at that point.
**UDFs and modules.** A UDF definition is a purely compile-time directive. It has an effect from the moment the function is defined till the end of the file (which extends to all the files included using the `#include` preprocessor directive). This implies that UDFs that occur inside calls to other `ERGO` modules are subject to the directives of the module where the functions occur, not in the module that is being called. For instance, consider

\begin{verbatim}
\udf func1(?x) := ?y \if pred1(?x,?y).
p(?x) :- q(func1(?x))@bar.
pred1(c,a).
\end{verbatim}

Here `func1` will be compiled according to the function definition shown above. If the module `bar` has another definition for `func1`, that definition has no effect on the above occurrence of `func1(?x)`. Thus, the query

?- p(c).

results in a call to `q(func1(c))@bar`, and since `func1(c)` is defined to be `a` this is tantamount to executing the query

?- q(a).

Note that, since function definitions can contain anything that constitutes a rule body, calls to other modules are allowed. For instance,

\begin{verbatim}
\udf foo(?x):=?y \if pred(?x,?y)@bar, pred(?x,?y,?z)@moo, q(?z).
\end{verbatim}

**UDFs and updates.** At present, only non-transactional UDFs are supported. If a UDF definition contains an update then a runtime error will result. For instance, if a UDF `foo(...)` has such a definition then the following error will likely occur at runtime:

+++Error[ERGO]> non-transactional head-literal foo(...) := ?A depends on an update

Stealth updates (Section 27.6) are allowed in UDF definitions (in `ERGO` only). Example:

```sql
\udf fooUDF(?form) := ?res \if %fooPRED(?form, ?res).
?- ?A = fooUDF(1).
?A = 2
```
Advanced examples. One of the most interesting examples of the use of UDFs arises when we define arithmetic operations as functions. For instance, normally one would write

```prolog
?- ?\(x \leftarrow 1+2\), writeln(?\(x)@\io).
```

but with UDFs we can define “+” as a function:

```
\(\text{udf } ?x+?y := ?z \leftarrow ?x+?y\).
```

and then issue the following query:

```prolog
?- writeln(1+2)@\io.
```

The following example shows how we can define the Fibonacci function:

```
\(\text{udf } ?x+?y := ?z \leftarrow ?z \leftarrow ?x+?y\).
\(\text{udf } ?x-?y := ?z \leftarrow ?z \leftarrow ?x-?y\).
\(\text{udf } \text{fib}(0) := 0\).
\(\text{udf } \text{fib}(1) := 1\).
\(\text{udf } \text{fib}(?x) := \text{fib}(?x-1)+\text{fib}(?x-2) \leftarrow ?x>1\).
```

We can now ask the query

```prolog
?- writeln(\text{fib}(34))@\io.
```

Note that the above example also illustrates that a definition of a UDF can consist of multiple \(\text{udf}\)-statements—just like a definition of a predicate can have multiple rules.

Querying UDFs. ERGO maintains meta-information about UDFs and they can be queried at runtime using the primitives \texttt{clause(...)} and \texttt{@!(...)}. For instance,

```
\text{udf } \text{foo}(?X,?Y) := p(?Z) \text{ bar}(?X,?Y,?Z).
```

```
\texttt{ergo> } \texttt{clause@!{?X[type->?T]} ?H,?B}.
```
?X = 4  // 4 happens to be the Id of that UDF
?T = udf
?H = foo(?_h1642,?_h1643) := _h1637
?B = (${bar(?_h1642,?_h1643,?_h1660)@main}, _h1637 = p(_h1660))

ergo> clause{@!{?X[type->?T]} (?UDF(?,:) := ?s),?B}.

?X = 4
?T = udf
?UDF = foo
?B = (${bar(?_h5733,?_h5734,?_h5735)@main, _h5742 = p(_h5735))

ergo> @!{?X[type->?T]}.

?X = 4
?T = udf

Note from the second query above that the head of a UDF can be queried using the \( (udf := result) \) idiom. The parentheses around this idiom are important in that context. This is because the expression \( \text{?UDF(?,:) := ?,?B} \) inside \( \text{clause{...}} \) above is parsed as \( \text{?UDF(?,:) := (?,?B)} \) and not as \( (\text{?UDF(?,:) := ?}), \text{?B} \).

### 25.2 Higher-order UDFs

UDFs can use arbitrary HiLog terms. These terms can be used both in the head of the UDF definition and in its body. For instance,

\[
\text{\texttt{\textbackslash ud f \textbackslash ab c(?x):=?x(a,b).}}
\]
\[
\text{\texttt{\textbackslash ud f \textbackslash ?x(?y,b)(?y):=t(?z) \textbackslash i f \texttt{pred(?x,?y,?z).}}} \\
\text{\texttt{\textbackslash ud f \textbackslash t(c):=d.}}
\]
\[
\text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{pred(foo,a,c).}}}}}}
\]
\[
\text{\texttt{\texttt{q(d).}}}
\]
\[
\text{\texttt{?- q(abc(?x)(?y)).}}
\]

Perhaps it is not obvious, but the query succeeds with the answers \( ?x = \text{foo, } ?y = a \). Indeed, \( \text{abc(?x)} \) rewrites to \( ?x(a,b) \) by the first UDF definition, so the query becomes \( q(?x(a,b)(?y)) \). By the second (higher-order!) UDF, this rewrites to \( q(t(c)) \) with the bindings \( ?x=\text{foo} \) and \( ?y=a \). Finally, the query rewrites to \( q(d) \), by the third UDF, and succeeds.
25.3 User-defined Functions and Multifile Modules

Recall from Section 16.5 that sets of rules can be added to an already loaded module using the `add{file}` or `[+file]` commands. If the already loaded module has UDF definitions, say, for `foo/2` and `bar/3`, and if the file `file.ergo` uses those functions, then it is necessary to tell ERGO in the file `file.ergo` that these are UDFs and not regular HiLog function symbols. If this is not done, the things are not unlikely to work correctly and it would be very hard to find out why. To prevent this type of hard-to-find mistakes, the system will issue an error at loading time.\(^\text{13}\)

To deal with such situations, ERGO provides the `useudf` directive. For instance, if one puts the following at the top of `file.ergo`

```prolog
:- useudf{foo/2, bar/3}.
```

then `foo/2` and `bar/3` will be compiled correctly in `file.ergo` and no errors will be issued.

**Note:** UDF definitions and the `useudf` directives are intended to reside in different files (for the same UDF): it makes no good sense to have both a function definition and a `useudf` directive for the same UDF in the same file. However, ERGO is tolerant to this kind of misspecification. \(\Box\)

To simplify the use of UDFs, ERGO supports implicit `useudf` directives in certain cases. Namely, if a file with a UDF definition is loaded into a module then any file that will be compiled and then added to that same module in that ERGO session will inherit the existing function definitions. In this case, there is no need to specify the `useudf` directive explicitly in `foo.ergo`. However, if the file being added, say `foo.ergo`, is compiled in a different ERGO session (one that does not have the appropriate UDF definitions) then an explicit `useudf` directive would be required. Otherwise, a runtime error will be issued the next time `foo.ergo` is added if there is a mismatch between the UDF definitions in these two different ERGO sessions.

25.4 Semantics

Semantically, the functional notation is just a syntactic sugar. A function definition of the form

\[
\text{\texttt{\textbackslash udf \textit{foo}(t1,\ldots,tn)} := \textit{Expr} \textit{if Body}}
\]

is converted into the rule

\[
\text{\texttt{newpred}_{\textit{foo}(t1,\ldots,tn,\textit{Expr})} := \textit{Body}.}
\]

\(^{13}\) It is impossible to catch this mistake at compile time, since one cannot know in advance that `file.ergo` is intended to be loaded into a module with existing UDF definitions. The `useudf` directive is used to supply precisely this kind of information to the compiler.
Then every occurrence of the function in a rule head

\[
\text{head}(\ldots, \text{foo}(s_1, \ldots, s_n), \ldots) :- \text{rulebody}.
\]

is rewritten into

\[
\text{head}(\ldots, ?\text{newvar}, \ldots) :- \text{newpred}_\text{foo}(s_1, \ldots, s_n, ?\text{newvar}), \text{rulebody}.
\]

In the rule body, the occurrences of \(\text{foo}(s_1, \ldots, s_n)\) are rewritten as follows:

\[
\ldots :- \ldots, \text{pred}(\ldots, \text{foo}(s_1, \ldots, s_n), \ldots), \ldots
\]

is changed to

\[
\ldots :- \ldots, \text{newpred}_\text{foo}(s_1, \ldots, s_n, ?\text{newvar}), \text{pred}(\ldots, ?\text{newvar}, \ldots), \ldots
\]

It is important to keep in mind that UDFs are partial functions and that any argument bindings for which an UDF is undefined falsifies the containing predicate or frame. For instance,

\[
\begin{align*}
p(\ldots). \\
\text{\texttt{\textbackslash udf f}(?x) := ?y \text{ \texttt{\textbackslash if} cond(?x, ?y).}} \\
\text{\texttt{cond}(1,2).} \\
?\text{- p(f(1)).} \\
\text{Yes} \\
?\text{- p(f(2)).} \\
\text{No}
\end{align*}
\]

Here \(f(?x)\) is a partial function that is defined only for \(?x=1\). Since \(f(1)=2\) and \(p(\ldots)\) is true of everything, \(p(f(1))\) evaluates to true. However, \(p(f(2))\) evaluates to false because \(f(2)\) is undefined and this falsifies \(p(f(2))\). The rationale is that \(p(\ldots)\) is true of every defined argument, but is false when an argument cannot be evaluated to a bona fide term.

### 25.5 Representing equality with user defined functions

An important application of UDFs is simulation of certain cases of equality. Simulating equality using UDFs is orders of magnitude more efficient. The equality that can be simulated in this way must be such that all terms that one wants to equate must be explicitly given at compile time. For instance, a term or its main function symbol cannot be represented by a variable (e.g., \(?X\) or \(?X(?y, ?z)\)) and determined only at run time. Also, if the system of UDF definitions is not
**confluent** (confluence is also known as the Church-Rosser property) then the fundamental property of substitutivity of equals by equals cannot be guaranteed.

For instance, equality of the following kind ?x = abc, ?x(pqr) := cde cannot be simulated because the term abc(pqr) that is equated to cde here is not explicitly given at compile time.

It is important to also keep in mind that UDFs provide only **unidirectional** rewriting. For instance, in

\begin{verbatim}
\ufdf a := b.
\ufdf a := c.
q(c).
?- q(b).
\end{verbatim}

the query fails, since b is not rewritten back into a (and then into c).

To illustrate the cases where simulation is possible, suppose we want to state that any occurrence of foo(?x) should be equated to (rewritten into) bar(?x) if pred(?x) is true and ?x>2:

\begin{verbatim}
\ufdf foo(?x):=bar(?x) if pred(?x), ?x>2.
pred(1).
pred(2).
pred(3).
pred(5).
\end{verbatim}

If we ask query

?- foo(?x)=bar(?x)

The answers will be

?x=2
?x=3

Here are some very simple, but useful examples of equality: rather than writing things like

foo(1) :=: 3.
foo(4) :=: 7.

we can instead define
\texttt{\texttt{udf} foo(1):=3.}
\texttt{\texttt{udf} foo(4):=7.}

The latter does not involve complex equality maintenance and is much more efficient.

The following example illustrates the issue of non-confluence of the equality through UDFs. Consider the following definitions:

\texttt{\texttt{udf} a := b.}
\texttt{\texttt{udf} c := d.}
\texttt{\texttt{udf} a := c.}

and suppose \( p(d) \) is true. Then we can derive that \( p(a) \) and \( p(c) \) is true, but not that \( p(b) \) is true.

Note that if instead of \( p(d) \) we had \( p(a) \) then all these would be true: \( p(b), p(c), p(d) \). This shows that one can go a long way with simulation of equality through UDFs, but care must be exercised. For example, if the set of UDF definitions is not confluent then substitution of equals by equals is not always guaranteed.

### 26 Controlling Context of Symbols

Using the same symbol in different contexts in the same knowledge base can be useful, but often can be the result of a typo, and such errors is very hard to catch. Examples of different contexts include the use of the same symbol as a function symbol and as a predicate, as a regular function symbol and a UDF, and even the uses of the same symbol with different arities.

\emph{ERGO} checks if the same symbol appears in different contexts and issues warnings if it finds such uses. For instance, in

\[
\begin{align*}
p(?x, ?y, ?z) & : -q(?x, ?y, ?z). \\
p(?x) & : -t(?x).
\end{align*}
\]

the predicate \( p \) is used with arity 3 and 1, which may or may not be a mistake. In the following,

\[
\begin{align*}
p(?x) & : -q(?x). \\
f(p(?x, ?y)) & : -t(?x).
\end{align*}
\]

\( p \) occurs both as a predicate and a function symbol, and with different arities on top. In the next example we encounter the symbol \( f \) in the role of a UDF and also as a predicate:
\texttt{udf} f(?x):=?y \texttt{if} ff(?x,?y).
\texttt{t(?x):-f(?x)}.

and, in the next example, \texttt{tp} has both transactional and non-transactional occurrences.

\texttt{\%tp(?x,?y):-s(?x,?y)}.
\texttt{tp(?x,?y,?z):-q(?x,?y,?z)}.

UDFs are also not allowed to have the same name as \texttt{ERGO} builtins, such as \texttt{isatom...}, \texttt{isground...} and the like.

In all these cases, warnings will be issued. However, the user can turn off the warnings that she believes not to indicate an error. This is done with the help of the directive \texttt{symbol\_context}. The syntax is the following

\texttt{:- symbol\_context\{comma-separated-list-of-terms\}}

The terms in the aforementioned list can be function symbols, predicates, or UDFs. For each type there is a separate idiom to indicate what is to be permitted. The legal specifications are as follows:

1. \texttt{termName(?,...,?)@?, termName(?,...,?)@\, termName(?,...,?)@moduleName} — indicates that \texttt{termName} is a predicate of the given arity. The first form applies to all modules, the second applies to predicates that appear without any module specification (e.g., \texttt{abc(1,2)}), and the third applies to predicates in a specific module, \texttt{moduleName}.

2. \texttt{termName(?,...,?)} — indicates that \texttt{termName} is a term (not a predicate).

3. \texttt{udf termName(?,...,?)} — indicates that \texttt{termName} is a UDF.

4. \texttt{termName(*)@moduleName, termName(*), and udf termName(*)} — these are wildcards that have the same meaning as above except that the warnings for the terms of the form \texttt{termName(...)} are suppressed for all arities in the corresponding contexts (predicate, HiLog term, UDF).

5. \texttt{termName/N}, where \texttt{N} is a non-negative integer — suppresses warnings for terms of the form \texttt{termName(arg1,...,arg_N)} in any context (predicate, HiLog term, or a UDF).

6. \texttt{termName/?} — like \texttt{termName/N} above but suppresses warnings for all arities. Thus, warnings will not be issued for \texttt{termName(...)} in all contexts and for all arities.

7. \texttt{warnoff} — suppresses symbol context warnings, but not errors.
8. constoff — suppresses warnings due to constants appearing in multiple contexts. This not only affects warnings, but also performance. In very large fact bases, the number of constants is typically very large. For each constant, ERGO would normally create an entry in the .fls file, which is used to check for multiple contexts. For a large file, such an .fls file can be much larger than the original set of facts. With the constoff option, entries describing constants will not be saved in the .fls file, which can significantly improve the compilation and load time.

In the above, the arguments must be anonymous variables and moduleName can be either a module name or an anonymous variable. Examples:

```
:- symbol_context{p(?), q(?@?), r(?@?,?@bar, udf foo(?)}.  
```

Once this directive is issued, the compiler will no longer warn about the occurrences of p as a term with two arguments, q as a predicate with one argument in any module, r as a binary predicate in module bar, and foo as a unary UDF.

The symbol_context directive also has special syntax for sensors and predicates declared using the :- prolog{...} directive:

```
:- symbol_context{sensor foo(?@?), prlg bar(?@?,?@)}.  
```

Note that ERGO issues warnings only on finding a second inconsistent use of the same symbol. Since most symbols are used in just one context, there is no need to supply the above directive in most cases. For instance, in the following

```
:- symbol_context{p(?@?,)}.  
p(?x):-q(?x), t(?x).  
f(p(?x,?y)):-t(?x).  
```

one needs to notify the compiler only about the use of p(?@?,) as a function symbol, since there is prior use of p/1 as a predicate. The other symbols are used consistently and there is no need to do anything special for them.

## 27 Updating the Knowledge Base

ERGO provides primitives to update the runtime database. Unlike Prolog, ERGO does not require the user to define a predicate as dynamic in order to update it. Instead, every predicate and object has a base part and a derived part. Updates directly change only the base parts and only indirectly the derived parts.
Note that the base part of a predicate or of an object contains both the facts that were inserted explicitly into the knowledge base and the facts that are specified implicitly, via rules. For instance, in

\[
P(a).
\]
\[
a[m \rightarrow b].
\]

the fact \(p(a)\) will be placed in the base part of the predicate \(p/1\) and it can be deleted by the \texttt{delete} primitive. Likewise, the fact \(a[m \rightarrow b]\) is updatable. If you do not want some facts to be updatable, use the following syntax:

\[
P(a) :- \texttt{\{true}.\]
\[
a[m \rightarrow b] :- \texttt{\{true}.\]

\texttt{E}RGO updates can be non-transactional, as in Prolog, or transactional, as in Transaction Logic \cite{2,1}. We first describe non-transactional updates.

### 27.1 Non-transactional (Non-logical) Updates

The effects of non-transactional updates persist even if a subsequent failure causes the system to backtrack.

\texttt{E}RGO supports the following non-transactional update primitives: \texttt{insert}, \texttt{insertall}, \texttt{delete}, \texttt{deleteall}, \texttt{erase}, \texttt{eraseall}. These primitives use special syntax (the curly braces) and are not predicates. Thus, it is allowed to have a user-defined predicate such as \texttt{insert}.

**Insertion.** The syntax of an insertion is as follows (note the \{,\}):

\[
\texttt{\{insert literals | query\}}
\]

where \texttt{insert} stands for either \texttt{insert} or \texttt{insertall}. The \texttt{literals} part represents a comma separated list of literals, which can include predicates and frames. The optional part, \texttt{| query}, is an additional condition that must be satisfied in order for \texttt{literals} to be inserted. The semantics is that \texttt{query} is posed first and, if it is satisfied, \texttt{literals} is inserted (note that the query may affect the variable binding and thus the particular instance of \texttt{literals} that will be inserted). For instance, in

\[
?- \texttt{insert\{p(a),Mary[spouse->Smith,children->Frank]\}}
\]
\[
\]
the first statement inserts a particular frame. In the second case, the query \( ?S[\text{spouse} \rightarrow ?P] \) is posed and one answer (a binding for \(?P\) and \(?S\)) is obtained. If there is no such binding, nothing is inserted and the statement fails. Otherwise, the instance of \(?P[\text{spouse} \rightarrow ?S]\) is inserted for that binding and the statement succeeds.

The insert statement has two forms: `insert` and `insertall`. The difference between `insert` and `insertall` is that `insert` inserts only one instance of literals that satisfies the formula, while `insertall` inserts all instances of the literals that satisfy the formula. In other words, `query` is posed first and all answers are obtained. Each answer is a tuple of bindings for some (or all) of the variables that occur in literals. To illustrate the difference between `insert` and `insertall`, consider the following queries:

\[
\text{?- } p(?X,?Y), \text{ insert}\{q(?X,?Y,?Z)|r(?Y,?Z)\}.
\text{?- } p(?X,?Y), \text{ insertall}\{q(?X,?Y,?Z)|r(?Y,?Z)\}.
\]

In the first case, if \( p(x,y) \) and \( r(y,z) \) are true, then the fact \( q(x,y,z) \) is inserted. In the second case, if \( p(x,y) \) is true, then the update means the following:

For each \( z \) such that \( r(y,z) \) holds, `insert q(x,y,z)`.

The primitive `insertall` is also known as a bulk-insert operator.

Unlike `insert`, the operator `insertall` always succeeds and it always leaves its free variables unbound.

The difference between `insert` and `insertall` is more subtle than it may appear from the above discussion. In the all-answers mode, the above two queries will actually behave the same, because `ERGO` will try to find all answers to the query \( p(?X,?Y), r(?Y,?Z) \) and will do the insertion for each answer. The difference becomes apparent if `ERGO` is in one answer at a time mode (because `\one` was executed in a preceding query) or when the all-answers mode is suppressed by a cut as in

\[
\text{?- } p(?X,?Y), \text{ insert}\{q(?X,?Y,?Z)|r(?Y,?Z)\}, !.
\text{?- } p(?X,?Y), \text{ insertall}\{q(?X,?Y,?Z)|r(?Y,?Z)\}, !.
\]

In such cases, the first query will indeed insert only one fact, while the second will insert all.

Note that literals appearing inside an insert primitive (to the left of the `|` symbol, if it is present) are treated as facts and should follow the syntactic rules for facts and literals in the rule head. In particular, path expressions are not allowed. Similarly, module specifications inside update operators are illegal. However, it is allowed to insert facts into a different module so module specifications are permitted in the literals that appear in the `insert{...}` primitive:

\[
\text{?- } \text{insert}\{(\text{Mary}[\text{children} \rightarrow \text{Frank}], \text{John}[\text{father} \rightarrow \text{Smith}]) @ \text{foomod}\}
\]
The above statement will insert Mary[children->Frank] and John[father->Smith] into module foomod.

Note that module specifications are also allowed in the condition part of an update operator (to the right of the \ mark):

\[-\ insert\{Mary[children->?X]\@foobar \ | \ adult(?X)@infomod\}

Updates to Prolog modules is accomplished using the usual Prolog assert/retract:

\[-\ assert(foo(a,b,c))@\prolog.\]

The following subtleties related to updates of Prolog modules are worth noting. Recall Section 18.4 on the issues concerning the difference between the HiLog representation of terms in \(\mathcal{ERG}\)O and the one used in Prolog. The problem is that foo(a,b,c) is a HiLog term that Prolog does not understand and will not associate it with the predicate foo/3 that it might have. To avoid this problem, use explicit conversion:

\[-\ p2h\{?PrologRepr,foo(a,b,c)\}, \ assert(?PrologRepr)@\prolog.\]

This will insert foo(a,b,c) into the default XSB module called usermod.

If all this looks too complicated, \(\mathcal{E}\)RG\O provides a higher-level primitive, @\prologall (equivalently @\plgall), as described in Section 16.7. This module specifier does automatic conversion of terms to and from Prolog representation, so the above example can be written much more simply:

\[-\ assert(foo(a,b,c))@\prologall.\]

Another possible complication might be that if foo/3 is defined in another Prolog module, bar, and is imported by usermod, then the above statement will not do anything useful due to certain idiosyncrasies in the XSB module system. In this case, we have to tell the system that foo/3 was defined in Prolog module bar. Thus, if foo/3 was defined as a dynamic predicate in the module bar, we have to write:

\[-\ assert(foo(a,b,c)@\prolog(bar))@\prolog.\]

Note that if we want to assert a more complex fact, such as foo(f(a),b,c), we would have to use either

\[-\ assert(foo(f(a)@\prolog(bar),b,c)@\prolog(bar))@\prolog.\]
or @prologall:

?- assert(foo(f(a),b,c)@prologall(bar))@prolog.

We should also mention one important difference between insertion of facts in E RGO and Prolog. Prolog treats facts as members of a list, so duplicates are allowed and the order matters. In contrast, E RGO treats the database as a set of facts with no duplicates. Thus, insertion of a fact that is already in the database has no effect.

**Deletion.** The syntax of a deletion primitive is as follows:

```
delop{literals [| query]}
```

where delop can be delete, deleteall, erase, and eraseall. The literals part is a comma separated list of frames and predicates. The optional part, | query, represents an additional constraint or a restricted quantifier, similar to the one used in the insertion primitive.

For instance, the following predicate:

```
?- deleteall{John[?Year(?Semester)->?Course] | ?Year < 2000}
```

will delete John’s course selection history before the year 2000.

Note that the semantics of a delete{literal|query} statement is that first the query literal ∧ query should be asked. If it succeeds, then deletion is performed. For instance, if the database is

```
p(a). p(b). p(c). q(a). q(c).
```

then the query below:

```
?- deleteall{p(?X)|q(?X)}
```

will succeed with the variable ?X bound to a and c, and p(a), p(c) will be deleted. However, if the database contains only the facts p(b) and q(c), then the above predicate will succeed (deleteall always succeeds) and the database will stay unchanged.

E RGO provides four deletion primitives: delete, deleteall, erase, and eraseall. The primitive delete removes at most one fact at a time from the database. The primitives deleteall and eraseall are bulk delete operations; erase is kind of a hybrid: it starts slowly, by deleting one fact, but may go on a joy ride and end up deleting much of your data. These primitives are described below.
1. If there are several bindings or matches for the literals to be deleted, then `delete` will choose only one of them nondeterministically, and delete it. For instance, suppose the database contains the following facts:

\[ p(a). \ p(b). \ q(a). \ q(b). \]

then

\[ \text{?- delete}\{p(?X), q(?X)\} \]

will succeed with \(?X\) bound to either \(a\) or \(b\), depending on the ordering of facts in the database at runtime. However, as with insertion, in the all-answers mode the above deletion will take place for each binding that makes the query true. To avoid this, use one answer at a time mode or a cut.

2. In contrast to the plain `delete` primitive, `deleteall` will try to delete all bindings or matches. Namely, for each binding of variables produced by `query` it deletes the corresponding instance of `literal`. If `query \land literal` is false, the `deleteall` primitive fails. To illustrate, consider the following:

\[ \text{?- p(?X,?Y), deleteall}\{q(?X,?Y,?Z)\mid r(?Y,?Z)\}. \]

and suppose \(p(x,y)\) is true. Then the above statement will, for each \(z\) such that \(r(y,z)\) is true, delete \(q(x,y,z)\).

For another example, suppose the database contains the following facts:

\[ p(a). \ q(b). \ q(c). \]

and the query is `?- deleteall\{p(a), q(?X)\}`. The effect will be the deletion of \(p(a)\) and of all the facts in \(q\). (If you wanted to delete just one fact in \(q\), `delete` should have been used.) Unlike the `delete` predicate, `deleteall` always succeeds. Also, `deleteall` leaves all variables unbound.

3. `erase` works like `delete`, but with an object-oriented twist: For each F-logic fact, \(f\), that it deletes, `erase` will traverse the object tree by following \(f\)'s methods and delete all objects reachable in this way. It is a power-tool that can cause maiming and injury. Safety glasses and protective gear are recommended.

   Note that only the base part of the objects can be erased. If the object has a part that is derived from the facts that still exist, this part will not be erased.
4. **eraseall** is the take-no-prisoners version of **erase**. Just like **deleteall**, it first computes *query* and for each binding of variables it deletes the corresponding instance of *literal*. For each deleted object, it then finds all objects it references through its methods and deletes those. This continues recursively until nothing reachable is left. This primitive always succeeds and leaves its free variables unbound.

### 27.2 Transactional (Logical) Updates

The effects of transactional updates are **undone upon backtracking**, i.e., if some post-condition fails and the system backtracks, a previously inserted item will be removed from the database, and a previously deleted item will be put back.

The syntax of transactional update primitives is similar to that of non-transactional ones and the names are similar, too. The syntax for transactional insertion is:

\[
\text{t_insop}\{\text{literals} \mid \text{formula}\}
\]

while the syntax of a transactional deletion is:

\[
\text{t_delop}\{\text{literals} \mid \text{query}\}
\]

where \text{t_insop} stands for either \text{t_insert} or \text{t_insertall}, and \text{t_delop} stands for either of the following four deletion operations: \text{t_delete}, \text{t_deleteall}, \text{t_erase}, and \text{t_eraseall}. The meaning of *literals* and *query* is the same as in Section 27.1.

The new update operators \text{t_insert}, \text{t_insertall}, \text{t_delete}, \text{t_deleteall}, \text{t_erase}, and \text{t_eraseall} work similarly to the non-transactional **insert**, **delete**, **deleteall**, **erase**, and **eraseall**, respectively, except that the new operations are **transactional**. Please refer to Section 27.1 for details of the non-transactional update operators.

The keywords \text{tinsert}, \text{tinsertall}, \text{tdelete}, \text{tdeleteall}, \text{terase}, and \text{teraseall} are also understood and are synonymous to the \text{t_*} versions of the transactional operators.

To illustrate the difference between transactional and non-transactional updates, consider the following execution trace immediately after the \text{ERGO} system starts:

\[
\text{ergo}> \quad \text{insert}\{p(a)\}, \text{\textbackslash{}false}.
\]

\text{No}

\[
\text{ergo}> \quad p(a).
\]
Yes

\[\text{ergo}> \quad \text{t_insert}\{q(a)\}, \text{false}. \quad // \text{or tinsert}\{q(a)\},\]

No

\[\text{ergo}> \quad q(a).\]

No

In the above example, when the first \text{false} executes, the system backtracks to \text{insert}\{p(a)\} and does nothing. Thus the insertion of \text{p(a)} persists and the following query \text{p(a)} returns with \text{Yes}. However, when the second \text{false} executes, the system backtracks to \text{t_insert}\{q(a)\} and removes \text{q(a)} that was previously inserted into the database. Thus the next query \text{q(a)} returns with \text{No}. This behavior is similar to database transactions, hence the name “transactional” update.

Notes on working with transactional updates. Keep in mind that some things that Prolog programmers routinely do with \text{assert} and \text{retract} go against the very concept of transactional updates.

- \text{fail}-loops are not going to work (will leave the database unchanged) for obvious reasons. The loop forms \text{\while} and \text{\until} should be used in such situations.

- Tabled predicates or methods must never depend on transactional updates. First, as explained on page 150, tabled predicates should not depend on any predicates that have side effects, because this rarely makes sense. Second, when evaluating tabled predicates, XSB performs backtracking unbeknownst to the knowledge engineer. Therefore, if a tabled predicate depends on a transactional update, backtracking will happen invisibly, and the updates will be undone. Therefore, in such situations transactional updates will have no effect.

- As before, \text{t_insertall}, \text{t_deleteall}, and \text{t_eraseall} primitives always succeed and leave the free variables unbound. Likewise, in the all-answers mode, the primitives \text{t_insert}, \text{t_delete}, and \text{t_erase} behave similarly to the \text{t_*all} versions in other respects, i.e., they will insert or delete facts for every answer to the associated query. This can be prevented with the use of a cut or the \text{\one} directive.

27.3 Updates and Tabling
Changing predicates on which tabled predicates depend. By default, ERGO uses an advanced form of tabling, called reactive tabling. To understand what it is, consider the following knowledge base.

\[
p(?X) \leftarrow q(?X).
q(1).
?- p(?X).
\]

Loading this little example into ERGO will yield the answer \(?X = 1\), as expected. Next, suppose we add \(q(2)\) to the knowledge base and ask the same query, \(p(?X)\). This time, the answer will be both \(?X = 1\) and \(?X = 2\) — also as expected. Although one tends to take this behavior for granted, it is useful to understand what is going on here.

After the first query, the query itself and its single answer is recorded in a table. All subsequent calls to that query are supposed to be answered just by a table lookup, without using the rules that define \(p(?X)\). However, when \(q(2)\) is added, the system reacts and updates the answer table for our query. This is why we got the correct result when the query was issued the second time. This is achieved through the mechanism of reactive tabling of the underlying XSB inference engine. Natural as it is, implementing this type of tabling is very hard and XSB is the only logic programming system that supports it. Reactive tabling is similar to materialized view maintenance in commercial database systems. However, commercial DBMS have an easier job, as none of them does maintenance for recursive views. Even for non-recursive views, maintaining materialized views is not straightforward from the user point of view in such systems.

Passive (non-reactive) tabling mode. Although reactive tabling is what one usually needs, it is more expensive computationally. In some cases, a knowledge base might not be making any updates at all and paying the computational price of reactive tabling would be unjustified. For this case, ERGO allows the user to request passive tabling for any module.

In ERGO modules that use passive tabling, tables are not updated after they are constructed in response to queries. Therefore, subsequent updates followed by further queries in such modules may return incorrect (stale) answers. For instance, in the above example, the second query \(p(?X)\) will return a stale answer in which \(?X = 2\) will be missing.

To request passive tabling in a module at compile time, use this directive:

\[\text{:- setsemantics\{tabling=passive\}.}\]

Passive tabling can also be requested at run time, in which case the mode will change from reactive to passive on-the-fly:

\[?- \text{setsemantics\{tabling=passive\}.}\]
However, runtime changes to the tabling mode is not recommended and there are certain restrictions. For instance, this can be done only as a top-level query, not as part of any other query.

**Interaction between passive and reactive tabling.** In E/RGO, passive modules can issue calls to reactive modules and vice versa. However, inter-module queries (between passive and reactive and between passive and passive modules) will not be updated reactively in this case. Consider the following example:

```prolog
// Module m1 (reactive, by default) // Module m2 (passive)
:- setsemantics{tabling=passive}.
r(a).
s(?X) :- r(?X).
p(?X) :- s(?X)@m1.
%upd :- insert{r(b)}.
```

If the query \( p(?X)@m2 \) is issued first, one gets the answer \(?X=a\). Suppose next \%upd@m1 is invoked to update \( r/1 \). If then \( p(?X)@m2 \) is asked again, the answer will still be \(?X=a\) even though \( s(?X)@m1 \) would be reactively updated to include the answer \(?X=b\). The reason is that \( p(?X)@m2 \) is maintained passively, and it will not be alerted to the change in \( s(?X)@m1 \). Similarly, if \( m1 \) were passive and \( m2 \) reactive, the query \( p(?X)@m2 \) will still not be updated, but for a different reason: here \( s(?X)@m1 \) will not get updated, since in that case it would be maintained passively.

More generally, passively tabled queries invoked anywhere in the call-chain will stop update propagation up the chain. To illustrate, consider the following example:

```prolog
// Module m1 (reactive, by default) // Module m2 (passive)
:- setsemantics{tabling=passive}.
r(a).
s(?X) :- r(?X).
p(?X) :- q(?X)@m2.
%upd :- insert{r(b)}.
```

Here module \( m1 \) calls \( m2 \) and the latter calls back. If the queries \( s(?X)@m1 \) and \( p(?X)@m1 \) are issued then one gets \(?X=a\) as an answer in both cases. Suppose now that \%upd@m1 is invoked thereby changing \( r/1 \). Since \( m1 \) is reactive, the query \( s(?X)@m1 \) will now return both \(?X=a\) and \(?X=b\). On the other hand, \( p(?X)@m2 \) will still return only the first answer because it calls \( q(?X)@m2 \) and the change to \( r/1 \) is not propagated to \( q(?X)@m2 \), since the latter is defined in a passive module.

**Explicit refresh of passive tables.** What if updates in certain modules are very rare, but queries are frequent and time is money? In this case, passive tabling might still make sense.
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ERGO provides a partial redress in the form of the `refresh{...}` operator. This operator lets the knowledge engineer explicitly remove stale answers from tables. For instance, in the above example we could do the following:

```
  ergo> refresh{p(?)}, p(?X).
```

and get the right result. In general, `refresh{...}` can take a comma-separated list of facts to be purged from the tables, and these facts can even contain unbound variables. In the latter case, any stale call that unifies with the given facts will be refreshed. For instance,

```
  ergo> refresh{a[b->?X], c:?Y, p(z,?V)@foo}.
```

will refresh the tables for `a[b->?X]` and `c:?Y` in module `main`, and for `p(z,?V)` in module `foo`.

Sometimes it is desirable to completely get rid of all the information stored in tables—for instance, when it is hard to track down all the facts that might depend on the changed base facts. In such a case, the command

```
  ergo> \abolishtables.
```

can be used. However, this command should be executed only as a standalone query. Also, neither `refresh{...}` nor `\abolishtables` can occur under the scope of the negation operator `\naf` (either directly or indirectly).

Note that both `refresh` and `\abolishtables` can be also used in modules that use reactive tabling. However, in this case, `refresh` has no effect and `\abolishtables` will affect only the passive modules, if there are any.

**Tabled predicates that depend on update operations.** A related issue is that a tabled predicate (or a frame literal) might occur in the head of a rule that has an update operation in its body, or it may be transitively dependent on such an update. Note that this is different from the previous issue, where tabled predicates did not necessarily depend on update operations but rather on other predicates that were modified by these update operations.

In this case, the update operation will be executed the first time the tabled predicate is evaluated. Subsequent calls will return the predicate truth value from the tables, without invoking the predicate definition. Moreover, if the update statement is non-logical (i.e., non-transactional), then it is hard to predict how many times it will be executed (due to backtracking) before it will start being ignored due to tabling.

If ERGO compiler detects that a tabled literal depends on an update statement, a warning is issued, because such a dependency is most likely a mistake. This warning is issued also for
transactional methods (i.e., Boolean methods of the form \%foo(...) when a tabled literal depends on them. Moreover, because non-tabled HiLog predicates are regarded as having transactional side-effect by default, this warning is also issued when a tabled literal depends on non-tabled HiLog predicates. FLORA-2 also imposes restrictions on the use of updates that affect tabled facts: it does not allow such dependency to occur in modules with reactive tabling. ERGO does allow such dependency by providing the special feature of “stealth mode” updates.

See the stealth{...} primitive described in Section 27.6.

Here is an example of a situation where dependency on an update makes perfect sense. For instance, we might be computing a histogram of some function by computing its values at every point and then adding it to the histogram. When a value, \( f(a) \), is computed first, the histogram is updated. However, subsequent calls to \( f(a) \) (which might be made during the computation of other values for \( f \)) should not update the histogram. In this case it makes sense to make \( f/1 \) into a tabled predicate, whose definition will include an update operator. For this reason, a compiler directive ignore_depchk is provided to exempt certain predicates and methods from such dependency checks and thus silence the warnings.

The example below shows the usage of the ignore_depchk directive.

```prolog
:- ignore_depchk(%ins(?), ?[%?]@?).

\( t(?X,?Y) :- \%ins(?X), ?Y[close]\@\io. \)

\%ins(?X) :- insert{?X}.
```

No dependency warning is issued in this case. However, without the ignore_depchk{...} directive, three warnings would be issued saying that tabled literal \( t(?X,?Y) \) depends on \%ins(?X), ?Y[close], and insert. Notice that ignore_depchk{\%ins(\_),} tells the compiler to ignore not only dependencies on \%ins/1, but also all dependencies that have \%ins/1 in the path.

The ignore_depchk{...} directive can also be used to ignore direct dependencies on updates. For example,

```prolog
:- ignore_depchk{insert{?_,?_[?_].
```

ignores dependencies on conditional insertions which insert two literals such as insert\{a,b\|c,d,e\}. And

```prolog
:- ignore_depchk{insert{?}}.
```

ignores dependencies on unconditional insertions which insert exactly one literal such as insert\{p(a)\} but not insert\{p(a),p(b)\}. 
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We should also mention here that executing the command `warnings{compiler}` in the ERGO shell will turn the dependency checking off globally. In some cases, this can reduce the compilation time, but is discouraged except when debugging is finished.

### 27.4 Updates and Meta-programming

The update operators can take variables in place of literals to be inserted. For instance,

```
?- ?X = a[b->c], insert{?X}.
```

Here `=` is a meta-unification operator described in Section 18.1. One use for this facility is when one module, `foo`, provides methods that allow other modules to perform update operations on objects in `foo`. For instance, `foo` can have a rule

```
%update(?X,?Y) :- delete{?X}, insert{?Y}.
```

Other modules can then issue queries like

```
?- John[salary->?X]@foo, ?Y = ?X+1000,
```

### 27.5 Updates and Negation

Negation applied to methods that have side effects is typically a rich source of trouble and confusion.

First of all, applying negation to frames that involve non-transactional updates does not have logical semantics, and this requires the knowledge engineer to have a certain understanding of the operational semantics of ERGO (Section 24.4). In this case, the semantics of negation applied to methods or predicates that produce side-effects through updates or I/O is that of Prolog negation (Section 19.1).

When only transactional updates are used, the semantics is well defined and is provided by *Transaction Logic* [2, 1]. In particular, negation is also well defined. However, simply negating an update, `A`, is useless, since logically it means jumping to some random state that is not reachable via execution of `A`. As explained in [2, 1], negation is typically useful only in conjunction with `∧`, where it acts as a constraint, or with the hypothetical operator of possibility `<>`. In most cases, when the knowledge engineer wants to apply negation to a method that performs logical (transactional) updates, he has `~<>method` in mind, i.e., a test to verify that execution of `method` is not possible. Both `<>` and `~<>` (equivalently `\naf<>`) are supported in ERGO.
The idiom `\neg %method` is considered to be an error, but `\+ %method` and `\naf %method` (the latter interpreted as `\+ %method`) are permitted. However, they yield meaningful results only if %method has no side effects and is non-recursive.

A transaction of the form `?- <> expression` is true in the current state if the transaction `?- method` can be executed in the current state. The state, however, is not changed even if `?- method` does change the state during its execution. In other words, `?- <> expression` only tests if execution is possible. The transaction `?- ~ <> expression` tests if execution of `expression` is impossible. It is true if `?- expression` fails and false otherwise. However, regardless of whether `?- expression` fails or not, the current state underlying the knowledge base does not change. Note that `<>` and `\~ <>` can apply to a group of subgoals, if they are enclosed in parentheses. If the expression does not change the underlying state of the knowledge base then `?- <> expression` and `?- ~ <> expression` reduce to `?- expression` and `?- \naf expression`, respectively. Examples:

```
?- <> %p(?X).
?- <> (\%p(?X), q(?X, ?Y), %r(?Y)).
?- ~<>(\%p(?X), q(?X, ?Y), %r(?Y)).
?- ~<>(\%p(?X), q(?X, ?Y), <> %r(?Y)).
```

27.6 Stealth Updates

Issuing an update command while still evaluating a non-transactional subgoal in a reactive tabling module will cause a runtime error:

```
p(?X) :- insert{%abc}.
?- p(1).
++Error[Ergo]> tabled predicate/method depends on an update.
```

This happens because, while computing the truth value of `p(1)`, we changed the underlying knowledge base, which could have affected the result. In this particular case, inserting `%abc` cannot affect `p(1)` and the inference engine could have noticed this. However, maintaining precise dependencies among the literals is expensive and is usually not worth the effort and the computational cost. In general, of course, inserting `%abc` could have affected the truth value of `p(1)`, which makes `p(1)` even harder to evaluate, whence the error.

As discussed earlier, the above type of dependency is bad style and issuing an error makes perfect sense. However, in some situations, like the example of computing histograms on page 151, updates issued while evaluating tabled subgoals can be useful. Another situation when this facility could be used is when one needs to do some kind of bookkeeping such as recording if a particular tabled literal has ever been called.
To this end, ERGO provides the `stealth{...}` primitive, which can be used in insert and delete commands to make literals being inserted/deleted invisible to the reactive tabling mechanism, thus avoiding runtime errors. For instance,

```
p(?_X) :- insert{stealth{%abc,%p(2),a[%b]}}.
?- p(1).
```

Yes

And yes, only transactional literals, as in the above example, can be inserted/deleted with the help of the `stealth{...}` primitive. Without this primitive, even transactional literals cannot be used in updates while evaluating a tabled subgoal in a reactive module.

Note that transactional variables are allowed in stealth updates. For example,

```
ergo> ?X = ppp, insert{stealth{%?X(1)}}.
?X = ppp
```

```
ergo> %ppp(?X).
?X = 1
```

Another interesting use of stealth updates is defining UDFs (see Section 25) that have side effects like database updates. For instance, suppose we want a UDF to insert something into the database and return some result:

```
\df fooUDF(?form) := ?res \if %fooPRED(?form, ?res).
```

Unfortunately, this won’t work because if one asks the query `- ?A=fooUDF(1) then an error will result for the same reason as earlier in this section. However, changing `insert{%abc(?val)}` to `insert{stealth{%abc(?val)}` saves the day.

### 27.7 Counter Support

It is often necessary to maintain a global counter, which can be set, queried, and updated. In principle, this can be done by designating a certain unary predicate and updating its content as necessary. However, this is a bit cumbersome, and ERGO provides a more efficient way. A counter is just an ERGO symbol that can be accessed via the following operations:

- `counter{Name := Integer}` — set counter
• counter{Name := ?Var} — query counter
• counter{Name + Integer} — increment counter
• counter{Name − Integer} — decrement counter

For example,

?- counter{abc:=3}, counter{abc+5}, counter{abc=?X}.
?X = 8.

28 Insertion and Deletion of Rules

ERGO supports non-transactional insertion of rules into modules as well as deletion of inserted rules. A module in ERGO gets created when a file is loaded into it, as described in Section 4, or it can be created using the primitive newmodule. Subsequently, rules can be added to an existing module. Rules that are inserted via the insertrule and add(...) commands are called dynamic and the rules loaded using the load(...) or [...] commands are called static or compiled. Dynamic rules can be deleted via the deleterule command. As mentioned in Section 27, ERGO predicates and frames can have both static and dynamic parts and no special declaration is required to make a predicate dynamic. The same frame or a predicate can be defined by a mixture of static or dynamic rules.

In this section, we will first look at the syntax of creating new modules. Then we will describe how to insert rules and delete rules. Finally, we address other related issues, including tabling, indexing, and the cut.

28.1 Creation of a New Module and Module Erasure at Run-time

The syntax for creating a new module is as follows:

newmodule{modulename}

This creates a blank module with the given name and default semantics. If a module by that name already exists, an error results. A module created using newmodule can be used just as any module that was created by loading a user knowledge base.

A dual operation to module creation is erasemodule with the following syntax:

erasemodule{modulename}
The primitive `erasemodule` empties module out but does not delete it from the registry of modules, so new facts and rules can be inserted into that module again without the need to recreate that module with another `newmodule` command.

### 28.2 Insertion of Rules

Dynamic rules can be inserted before all static rules, using the primitive `insertrule_a`, or after all static rules, using the primitive `insertrule_z` or just `insertrule`. The reason for having three different insertion commands is the same as in Prolog: the position of a rule with respect to other rules may sometimes have an affect on performance or query termination.

Several rules can be inserted in the same command. The syntax of inserting a list of rules is as follows:

```
inruleop{rulelist}
```

where `inruleop` is either `insertrule_a`, `insertrule_z`, or `insertrule`, and `rulelist` is a comma-separated list of rules. The rules being inserted should not terminate with a period (unlike the static rules):

```
?- insertrule_a{?X:student :- %enroll(?X,_T)}.
```

The above inserts the rule `?X:student :- %enroll(?X,_T)` in front of the current module.

If a rule is meant to be inserted into a module other than the current one, then the rule needs to be parenthesized and the module name must be attached using the usual module operator. If several rules need to be inserted using the same command, each rule must be parenthesized. For example, the following statement inserts the same rule into two different modules: the current one and into module `mod1`.

```
?- insertrule_a{(?X:student :- %enroll(?X,_T)),
               (?X:student :- %enroll(?X,_T))@mod1}.
```

As a result, the rule `?X:student :- %enroll(?X,_T)` will be inserted in front of each of these two modules. For this to be executed successfully, the module `mod1` must already exist.

Note: rule IDs and other meta-data (see Section 36) can be supplied with the insert operator:

```
?- insertrule{@!{abc[foo->bar]} ?X:student :- %enroll(?X,_T)}.
```

Meta information can also be supplied with the `deleterule` operator.
28.3 Deletion of Rules

Rules inserted dynamically using \texttt{insertrule\_a} can be deleted using the primitive \texttt{deleterule\_a}, and rules inserted using \texttt{insertrule\_z} can be deleted using the primitive \texttt{deleterule\_z}. If the user wishes to delete a rule that was previously inserted using either \texttt{insertrule\_a} or \texttt{insertrule\_z} then the primitive \texttt{deleterule} can be used. Similarly to rule insertion, several rules can be deleted in the same command:

\[
\text{delruleop}\{\text{rulelist}\}
\]

where \texttt{delruleop} is either \texttt{deleterule\_a} or \texttt{deleterule\_z} and \texttt{rulelist} is a comma-separated list of rules. Rules in the list must be enclosed in parentheses and should not terminate with a period.

To delete the rules inserted in the second example of Section 28.2, we can use

\[
?- \text{deleterule\_a}\{(\text{?X:student} :- \text{\%enroll(?X,?_T)}),
\quad (\text{?X:student} :- \text{\%enroll(?X,?_T)})@\text{mod1}\}.
\]

or

\[
?- \text{deleterule}\{(\text{?X:student} :- \text{\%enroll(?X,?_T)}),
\quad (\text{?X:student} :- \text{\%enroll(?X,?_T)})@\text{mod1}\}.
\]

\texttt{\texttt{ERGO}} provides a flexible way to express rules to be deleted by allowing variable rule head, variable rule body, and variable module specification. For example, the rule deletions below are all valid:

\[
?- \text{deleterule}\{(\text{?H:-q(?X)})@\text{foo}\}.
\]
\[
?- \text{deleterule}\{(\text{?H:-q(?X)})@?M\}.
\]
\[
?- \text{deleterule}\{(\text{?H:-?B})\}.
\]

The last query attempts to delete every dynamically inserted rule. So, it should be used with great caution.

We should note that a rule with a composite head, such as

\[
o[b->?V1,c->?V2] :- \text{something(?V1,?V2)}.
\]

is treated as a pair of separate rules.
o[c->?V2] :- something(?V1,?V2).

Therefore

?- deleterule{ o[b->?V1] :- something(?V1,?V2) }.

will succeed and will delete the first of the above rules. Therefore, the following action will subsequently fail:


The problem of Cuts  What is behind rule insertion is pretty simple. As we know from Section 27, every predicate and object has a base part and a derived part. Now we further divide the derived part into three sub-parts: the dyna sub-part (the part that precedes all other facts in the predicate), the static sub-part, and the dynz sub-part. All rules inserted using insertrule_a go into the dyna sub-part; all the rules in the file go into the static sub-part; and all the rules inserted using insertrule_z go into the dynz sub-part.

This works well when there are no cuts in rules inserted by insertrule_a. With cuts, the knowledge base might not behave as expected. For example, if we have the following rules:

\[
\begin{align*}
p(?X) & :- r(?X) . \\
r(a) . \\
q(b) . \\
?- \text{ insertrule}_a\{ p(?X) :- q(?X), ! \} . \\
?- p(?X) .
\end{align*}
\]

we would normally expect the answer to be b only. However, ERGO will return two answers, a and b. This is because the cut affects only the dynamic part of p(?X), instead of all the rules for p/1.

29 Querying the Rule Base

Rule bases in ERGO can be queried in two ways. For basic querying, ERGO provides the \text{clause}\{\ldots\} primitive, which is severely limited: to query rules using rule heads the user must know the exact structure of thees rule heads after the omnification transformation (which is not always obvious—see Section 21); to query via the subformulas in the rule body, the user must know the structure of the body or to write programs for parsing rule bodies, which is fairly complicated. To simplify this task, ERGO maintains the structural database of the rules, which provides flexible interface for querying the rules.
29.1 Basic Querying of Rules via clause{...}

The rule base can be queried using the primitive clause. The syntax of clause is as follows:

\[
\text{clause}\{\text{head}, \text{body}\}
\]

where head can be anything that is allowed to appear in a rule head and body can be anything that can appear in a rule body. In addition, explicit module specifications are allowed in rule heads in the clause primitive. Both head and body represent templates that unify with the actual rules and those rules that unify with the templates are returned.

The following example illustrates the use of the clause primitive. Suppose we have previously inserted several rules:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{?- insertrule} \_ \text{a}\{\text{tc}(\text{?X},\text{?Y}) : - \text{e}(\text{?X},\text{?Y})\}. \\
&\text{?- insertrule} \_ \text{a}\{\text{tc}(\text{?X},\text{?Y}) : - \text{tc}(\text{?X},\text{?Z}), \text{e}(\text{?Z},\text{?Y})\}. \\
&\text{?- newmodule}\{\text{foo}\}. \\
&\text{?- insertrule} \_ \text{a}\{\{\text{tc}(\text{?X},\text{?Y}) : - \text{e}(\text{?X},\text{?Y})\@\}\@\text{foo}\}. \\
&\text{?- insertrule} \_ \text{a}\{\{\text{tc}(\text{?X},\text{?Y}) : - \text{tc}(\text{?X},\text{?Z}), \text{e}(\text{?Z},\text{?Y})\@\}\@\text{foo}\}. \\
\end{align*}
\]

Then the query

\[
\text{?- clause}\{\text{?X},\text{?Y}\}.
\]

will list all the inserted rules. In this case, four rules will be returned. To query specific rules in a specific module — for example, rules defined for the predicate tc/2 in the module foo — we can use

\[
\text{?- clause}\{\text{tc}(\text{?X},\text{?Y})@\text{foo},\text{?Z}\}.
\]

We can also query rules by providing patterns for their bodies. For example, the query

\[
\text{?- clause}\{\text{?X}, \text{e}(\_\_,\_\_)\}.
\]

will return the first and the third rules.

Querying rules with composite heads involves the following subtlety. Recall from Section 28.3 that a rule with a composite head, such as

\[
\]
is treated as a pair of rules

\[
\begin{align*}
o[b\rightarrow?V1] & : - \text{something(?V1,?V2).} \\
o[c\rightarrow?V2] & : - \text{something(?V1,?V2).}
\end{align*}
\]

Therefore, if we delete one of these rules, for instance,

\[?- \text{deleterule{o[b\rightarrow?V1] :- something(?V1,?V2)}.}\]

then a query with a composite head that involves the head of the deleted rule will fail (unless there is another matching rule). Thus, the following query will fail:

\[?- \text{clause{o[b\rightarrow?V1,d\rightarrow?V2], ?Body}.}\]

The \texttt{clause} primitive can be used to query static rules just as it can be used to query dynamic rules. The normal two-argument primitive queries all rules. If one wants to query only the static (compiled) rules or only dynamic (inserted) rules, then the three-argument primitive can be used.

\texttt{clause\{type,head,body\}}

For example,

\[?- \text{clause\{static,?X,?Y\}.} \]
\[?- \text{clause\{dynamic,?X,?Y\}.} \]

Within the dynamic rules, one can separately query just the dynamic rules that precede all the static rules (using the flag \texttt{dyna}) or just those dynamic rules that follow all the static ones (with the \texttt{dynz} flag):

\[?- \text{clause\{dyna,?X,?Y\}.} \]
\[?- \text{clause\{dynz,?X,?Y\}.} \]

Due to a limitation of the underlying Prolog system, the \texttt{clause\{\ldots\}} primitive cannot query rules whose size exceeds a limit imposed by the Prolog system. A warning message is issued when a rule exceeds this limit and thus cannot be retrieved by \texttt{clause}. The only way to remedy this problem is to split the long rule into smaller rules by introducing intermediate predicates.

The \texttt{clause\{\ldots\}} statement can also be used to query by the \textit{rule Id} and other meta-data (rule descriptors) associated with \texttt{ERGO} rules. This form of the clause statement is described in Section 36.4. Here is an example of querying by rule Id:
?- clause{@!{myrule1} ?Head, ?Body}.

Note that ERGO facts are different from rules. They cannot be queried using the clause primitive. Instead, the primitive isbasefact{...} should be used for that. For instance,

a:b.
?- isbasefact{a:b}.
Yes

?- clause{a:b,?}.
No

29.2 Querying Rules via the Rule Structure Database

The rule structure database provides a simple yet powerful interface for querying the rule structure of ERGO knowledge bases. In many respects, this interface goes beyond what clause{...} can do, but it does not replace clause{...}. The major advance over clause{...} is that it allows one to find all rules containing a particular atomic formula—either in the head or in the body. This is possible even if the formula occurs under \neg and/or \naf, under a quantifier, aggregate, and other constructs. In addition, the query can have complex goals such as those allowed under the Lloyd-Topor and omniformity extensions described in Sections 20 and 21.

Requesting the structural database feature. ERGO does not build the structure database by default because of a slight overhead in compile time, load time, and additional demands on RAM. The user can request that ERGO builds a structure database for a file by placing the directive

`:use_rule_structure_db.`

in the file (or in a file include'ed in that file). If the above directive is not present, the calls to the structural query API will simply fail (will return false).

If, for some reason, it is preferable to not include the above directive in a file, structure database may be requested at runtime by executing the primitive use_rule_structure_db{Module,Flag} as a query. For instance,

?- use_rule_structure_db{foo,on}.

From then on, any file compiled for loading into the module foo will have the rule structure database available. To turn this mode off, use
?- use_rule_structure_db{foo,off}.

Note, these commands affect only the files that need recompilation (because they were never compiled or because they were changed since their last compilation). If a file was compiled before the change in the default mode for rule structure databases (from on to off or vice versa) then reloading such a file will not cause a recompilation and thus the availability of that database with respect to the aforesaid file will not change.

**Structural queries.** The structural database provides special primitives for querying the rule structure:

  Here ?Goal and ?SearchSpec must be bound. The ?Goal argument is a formula that is allowed in the head or the body of a rule; it does not need to be reified, as FROGO knows what to expect here. The ?Goal formula is decomposed into a list of atomic frames or predicates and then the rule base is searched according to ?SearchSpec. The latter can be as follows:
  
  - **any** — means that a rule satisfies the search condition if it contains any of the aforesaid atomic formulas (in the head or body)
  - **all** — means a rule satisfies the search condition if it matches all of the aforesaid atomic formulas (whether they appear in the head or body)
  - \( X + Y \), where \( X \) can be any or all and \( Y \) can be head, body or a variable. For instance, **all+head** means that for a rule to satisfy the search condition it must contain all of the aforesaid atomic formulas in the head; **all+body** is similar except that all the formulas must occur in the body of that rule. If **any+head** is given, it means that it is enough to have just one of the aforesaid atomic formulas in the rule head, and so on.

  The output variables are ?Id, ?Module, and ?File. Why these three? Recall from Section 36 that a rule Id is composed out of these three components and knowing them opens the door to the host of rule manipulation meta-facilities described in this manual.

  Here ?Id and ?Module must be bound before issuing a call to this primitive. That is, given a partial (or complete) rule Id, this primitive returns the atomic formulas that occur in the corresponding rules (via the ?Goal variable). In addition, for each such formula, it tells us (via the ?LocationInRule variable) whether that formula occurs in the rule head or in its body.
  
  Finally, the semantic context of the formula is also returned as a list of semantic attributes. The relevant semantic attributes are \( naf, \neg, \oplus \), and all the aggregate functions \texttt{avg}, \texttt{sub}, \texttt{setof}, and the others. For instance, if, say, \( \text{max}\{X \mid p(X, X), naf \neg q(Y)\} \) appears in the rule then the semantic context of \( p(X, Y) \) would be the list \[\text{[max]}\] while for
$q(?Y)$ it will be $\neg, \naf, \max$ (the semantic attributes are listed in the reverse order of their appearance).

Here are some examples that illustrate the use of the above primitives.

```prolog
:- use_rule_structure_db.
@!{r1} p(?X) :- q(?X), r(?X).
@!{r2} p(?X) ==> r(?X) :- q(?X), ?X=avg{?V|\neg t(?V)}.
@!{r3} \neg q(?X) :- \neg p(?X).
?- structdb{(p(?)==>r(?)),all+head,?Id,?Mod,?File}.
?- structdb{(p(?)==>r(?)),all,?Id,?Mod,?File}.
?- structdb{(p(?)==>r(?)),any,?Id,?Mod,?File}.
?- structdb{r2,main,?,?P,?H,?C}.
```

Then the first query returns

```prolog
?ID = r2
?Mod = main
?File = 'foo.ergo'
```

because $p(?)$ and $r(?)$ both occur in the rule head only in rule $r2$. The second query returns

```prolog
?ID = r1
?Mod = main
?File = 'foo.ergo'
```

```prolog
?ID = r2
?Mod = main
?File = 'foo.ergo'
```

because $p(?)$ and $r(?)$ both occur in some part of a rule (head or body) in rules $r1$ and $r2$. The third query returns information about all three rules because it is looking for rules where either $p(?)$ or $r(?)$ occur (in the head or body). Finally, the last query (which uses the 6-argument version of the structdb primitive) returns the information about all the literals found in rule $r2$. For each literal it says where the literal occurs and in what context:

```prolog
?P = ${p(?_h2847)@main}
?H = body
?C = []
```
Of particular interest here are the answers such as

```
?P = ${p(?_h2875)@main}
?H = head
?C = ['\neg']

?P = ${q(?_h2819)@main}
?H = body
?C = []

?P = ${r(?_h2729)@main}
?H = head
?C = []

?P = ${r(?_h2757)@main}
?H = body
?C = ['\neg']

?P = ${t(?_h2787)@main}
?H = body
?C = ['\neg', avg]

?P = ${\neg p(?_h2963)@main}
?H = head
?C = []

?P = ${\neg r(?_h2905)@main}
?H = body
?C = []

?P = ${\neg t(?_h2933)@main}
?H = body
?C = [avg]
```
The first says that \( r(\ldots) \) occurs in the body under negation \( \neg \), the second says that \( t(\ldots) \) occurs in the body under first \( \neg \) and then the aggregation \( \text{avg} \). The last answer rephrases the second one, saying that the literal \( \neg t(\ldots) \) occurs under aggregation \( \text{avg} \).

Finally, we give an example of a 5-argument \texttt{structdb} query where the mode has form \texttt{all+}?Y or \texttt{any+}?Y:

\[
\text{- structdb}\{(p(?)==r(?)), all+?H, ?Id, ?Mod, ?F}\).
\]

\[
\text{?H = body}
\]
\[
\text{?Id = r2}
\]
\[
\text{?Mod = main}
\]
\[
\text{?F = ‘foo.ergo’}
\]

\[
\text{?H = head}
\]
\[
\text{?Id = r2}
\]
\[
\text{?Mod = main}
\]
\[
\text{?F = ‘foo.ergo’}
\]

We do know that \( r2 \) is the right rule here, but one might wonder why in the first answer \( \text{?H} \) is bound to \texttt{body} while in the second to \texttt{head}. On the surface, the first answer seems incorrect since in rule \( r2 \) both \( p(\text{?}) \) and \( r(\text{?}) \) seem to appear in the head only. The explanation is that that rule \( p(\text{?})\Rightarrow r(\text{?}) \leftarrow q(\text{?}) \), \( \text{?X=avg}\{\text{?V}\backslash \neg t(\text{?V})\} \) has a composite head, which gets transformed by the omniformity transformation (Section 21) into two rules:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{r(\text{?X}) :&= q(\text{?X}), \text{?X=avg}\{\text{?V}\backslash \neg t(\text{?V})\}, p(\text{?X}).} \\
\text{\neg p(\text{?X}) :&= q(\text{?X}), \text{?X=avg}\{\text{?V}\backslash \neg t(\text{?V})\}, \neg r(\text{?X}).}
\end{align*}
\]

Thus, in reality, both \( r(\text{?}) \) and \( p(\text{?}) \) appear in the head as well as in the body of the rules created out of the original rule.
30 Aggregate Operations

Aggregate operators play an important role in data analytics applications and are commonly used in database languages. This section describes the aggregate operators available in ERGO.

30.1 Syntax of Aggregate Operators

An aggregate query in ERGO has the following form:\footnote{The syntax for aggregates is similar to that used in the FLORID system 
http://www.informatik.uni-freiburg.de/~dbis/florid/.

\begin{verbatim}
agg{?X | query}
agg{?X[?Gs] | query}
\end{verbatim}

where

- `agg` is the aggregate operator; it can be one of these: `min`, `max`, `count`, `countdistinct`, `sum`, `sumdistinct`, `avg`, `avgdistinct`, `setof`, `bagof`.
- `?X` is called the aggregation variable.
- `?Gs` is a list of comma-separated grouping variables `bagoff` aggregate operations are to be sorted.
- `query` is a logical formula that specifies the query conditions; it has the form of a rule body formula (including conjunctions, disjunctions, quantifiers, and even nested aggregation).

All the variables appearing in `query` but not in `?X`, `?Gs`, and not appearing prior to the aggregation are considered to be existentially quantified. Furthermore, the syntax of an aggregate must satisfy the following conditions:

1. All names of variables in both `?X` and `?Gs` must appear in `query`.
2. `?Gs` should not contain `?X`.

The `setof` and `bagof` aggregates have three additional forms:

\begin{verbatim}
agg{?X(SortSpec) | query}
agg{?X[?Gs](SortSpec) | query}
agg{?X[?Gs](SortSpec1,SortSpec2) | query}
\end{verbatim}

where `SortSpec` specifies how the result of the `setof`. The exact syntax for this is described in Section 30.4.
30.2 Evaluation of Aggregates

Aggregates are evaluated as follows: First, the query condition specified in query is evaluated to obtain all the bindings for the template of the form <?X, ?Gs>. Then, these tuples are grouped according to each distinct binding for <?Gs>. Finally, for each group, the aggregate operator is applied to the list of bindings for the aggregate variable ?X.

The following aggregate operators are supported in ERGO: min, max, count, countdistinct, sum, sumdistinct, avg, avgdistinct, setof, and bagof.

The operators min and max can apply to any list of terms. The order among terms is defined by the Prolog operator @=<. In contrast, the operators sum, avg, sumdistinct, and avgdistinct can take numbers only. If the aggregate variable is instantiated to something other than a number, these operators will discard it and produce a runtime warning message.

The operator bagof collects all the bindings of the aggregation variable into a list. The operator setof works similarly to bagof, except that all the duplicates are removed from the result list and the resulting list is sorted lexicographically. Note that these operators create ordered lists, not sets, unlike what the operator names might suggest.

Note: The aggregates min, max, avg, and avgdistinct fail if query produces no answers. In contrast, sum, count, sumdistinct, and countdistinct return 0 in such a case, and the operators bagof and setof return the empty list.

The difference between sum, count, and avg on the one hand and sumdistinct, countdistinct, and avgdistinct on the other is that the latter eliminate duplicates from the bindings produced by query. Thus, for example, if query binds the aggregate variable to, say 31, more than once then countdistinct will count this only once (and sumdistinct, avgdistinct will consider this binding only once also), while count (respectively, sum and avg) will consider 31 as many times as it was produced by the query. Example:

\[
p(\{31,45\}).
p(?X) :- ?X=31.
\]

Here count{?X|p(?X)} yields 3 and sum{?X|p(?X)} evaluates to 107, while countdistinct{?X|p(?X)} yields 2 and sumdistinct{?X|p(?X)} produces 76. This is because the answer p(31) will be derived twice: once via one of the above facts and once via the rule. (One might not realize this by posing the top-level query ?- p(?X), since ERGO eliminates duplicate answers before showing them to the user).

In general, aggregates can appear wherever a number or a list is allowed. Therefore, aggregates can be nested. The following examples illustrate the use of aggregates (some borrowed from the FLORID manual):
?- ?Z = \min\{?S\mid \text{John}[\text{salary}(\text{?Year})\rightarrow ?S]\}.
?- ?Z = \text{count}\{?\text{Year}\mid \text{John}.\text{salary}(\text{?Year})<\text{max}\{?S\mid \text{John}[\text{salary}(\text{?Y})\rightarrow ?S]\}, \text{?Y}<\text{?Year}\}.
?- \text{avg}\{?S[\text{?Who}]\mid \text{?Who}: \text{employee}[\text{salary}(\text{?Year})\rightarrow ?S]\} > 20000.

If an aggregate contains grouping variables then this aggregate would backtrack over such grouping
variables. In other words, grouping variables are considered to be existentially quantified (and the
scope of that quantifier is the entire rule body). For instance, in the last query above, the aggregate
will backtrack over the variable \(\text{?Who}\). Thus, if \text{John}'s and \text{Mary}'s average salary is greater than
20000, this query will backtrack and return both \text{John} and \text{Mary}.

The following query returns, for each employee, a list of years when this employee had salary
less than 60. This illustrates the use of the \text{setof} aggregate.

\begin{verbatim}
\text{ergo}> \ ?Z = \text{setof}\{?\text{Year}[?\text{Who}]\mid ?\text{Who}[\text{salary}(?\text{Year})\rightarrow ?X], ?X < 60\}.
\end{verbatim}
\(\ ?\text{Who} = \text{Mary}\)
\(\ ?\text{Who} = \text{John}\)

### 30.3 Notes on Scoping for Variables in Aggregate Operators

Another very important aspect is that the aggregation variable, \(?X\), has the scope that is restricted
to \text{query}. The scope of the grouping variables, \(?G\), is not limited to the query, but it is usually
\text{meaningless} for them to occur to the \text{left} of that scope. (The semantics of the aggregates will be
explained shortly.) Such an occurrence will cause a compile-time warning and, possibly, a run-time
error. To illustrate, consider the following rules:

\begin{verbatim}
\text{head} :- \ p(?X), \ r(?X), \ ?P = \text{sum}\{?X \mid q(?X)\}. \hspace{1cm} // \text{rule 1}
\text{head} :- \ p(?X,?W), \ r(?X), \ ?P = \text{avg}\{?X[?V,?W] \mid q(?X,?V,?W)\}. \hspace{1cm} // \text{rule 2}
\text{head} :- \ r(?X), \ ?P = \text{min}\{?X[?V,?W] \mid q(?X,?V,?W)\}, \ p(?X,?W). \hspace{1cm} // \text{rule 3}
\end{verbatim}

In the first rule, the first two occurrences of \(?X\) are outside of the scope of \text{sum}\{\ldots\} where \(?X\) is used
as an aggregation variable. Therefore, the first two occurrences represent variables that are distinct
from the variable used in the aggregation. This is similar to scoping of variables by universal and
existential quantifiers. In the second rule, the first two occurrences of \(?X\) are likewise unrelated to
the last two occurrences of \(?X\) in \text{avg}\{\ldots\}. The occurrence of \(?W\) to the left of the aggregation is
likely a logical error caused by a misunderstanding of grouping (or, at best, is meaningless). The
user probably needed this instead:
head :- p(?X,?W), r(?X), ?P = \text{avg}\{?X[?V] | q(?X,?V,?W)\}. \quad // \text{rule 2'}

If the user thought ?W was really needed among the grouping variables, then a different behavior
must have been sought. \textsc{Ergo} is zealous about this and will issue an stern warning, if it finds
such occurrences.\footnote{In some cases (e.g., in a disjunction like \texttt{p(?X) ; ?Z = \text{sum}\{?P[?X]\} | q(?P,?X)})}, \textsc{Ergo} might issue a false
warning. The user can circumvent this by renaming one of the occurrences of ?X.

Moreover, if, in the second rule above, p/2 binds ?W to a ground term then
a runtime error will be issued because it makes little sense to keep a constant in a grouping list.
It the user really understands what he is doing, he can avoid both the error and the warning by
rewriting the second rule as

\begin{align*}
\text{head} & : = p(?X,?WW), r(?X), \text{avg}\{?X[?V,?W] | q(?X,?V,?W), ?W=?WW\}. \quad // \text{rule 2''}
\end{align*}

but most likely the intent was rule 2' above where ?W was simply removed from the grouping list.

In contrast, the third rule above is proper (since ?W occurs to the right, not left, of the aggrega-
tion) but, perhaps, renaming the first ?X would have been an improvement.

### 30.4 Aggregation and Sorted Results

The aggregate functions \texttt{setof} and \texttt{bagof} also have other forms, which supports sorting of the
output of these aggregates:

\begin{align*}
\text{agg}\{?X(SortSpec) \mid \text{query}\} \\
\text{agg}\{?X[?Gs](SimpleSortSpec) \mid \text{query}\} \\
\text{agg}\{?X[?Gs]\{SortSpec1,SortSpec2\} \mid \text{query}\}
\end{align*}

where \texttt{agg} can be \texttt{setof} or \texttt{bagof}.

A \texttt{SortSpec} specifies how the output is to be sorted. It is either the constant \texttt{asc} (ascending),
\texttt{desc} (descending), or a list of the form \texttt{[spec1,...,specN]}, where each component has the form
\texttt{asc}(N) or \texttt{desc}(N) for some positive integer \texttt{N}. A \texttt{SimpleSortSpec} is either \texttt{asc} or \texttt{desc}.

The first form of the \texttt{setof/bagof} operator does not have grouping and the sort specification
controls the order in which the values of ?X that satisfy \texttt{query} will appear in the result of the
aggregation. As the names suggest, \texttt{asc} means ascending lexicographic ordering and \texttt{desc} means
that the order is descending. If the sort specification has the form \texttt{[spec1,...,specN]}, the control
of the sorted order is finer. The elements of the aggregation result will be sorted first according to
\texttt{spec1}, then \texttt{spec2}, etc.

Recall that each \texttt{spec-i} has the form \texttt{asc}(N) or \texttt{desc}(N), where \texttt{N} refers to a component of
each member of the aggregation result. In HiLog predicates, 1 refers to the predicate term (the
predicate name), 2 refers to the first argument, etc. In a frame \texttt{obj[prop->val]}, 1 refers to \texttt{obj}, 2 to \texttt{prop}, and 3 to \texttt{val}. In binary formulas, such as \texttt{L:=:R}, \texttt{L::R}, or \texttt{L:::R}, 1 refers to \texttt{L} and 2 to \texttt{R}. For lists, 1 refers to the first list element, 2 to the second, etc. Note that if \texttt{N} refers to a non-existing component of a formula, an error will be issued from the Prolog level.

The second form of the above aggregates uses a simplified form of the sort specification (i.e., \texttt{asc} or \texttt{desc}). It provides a simple way of controlling the ordering for both the instantiations of the grouping variables and the aggregation result. For example, if the sorting specification is \texttt{asc} then first we will get the results that are grouped around the smallest instance of \texttt{Gs}, and those results themselves will be ordered in the ascending order. On backtracking, we get the results grouped around the next-smallest instantiation of \texttt{Gs} and, again, those results will be ordered in the ascending order.

The third form of the above \texttt{setof/bagof} aggregates provides the most general means of controlling the ordering for the case when grouping is used. Here \texttt{SortSpec1} is used to control the results and \texttt{SortSpec2} controls the grouping order. That is, the instances of \texttt{Gs} are first ordered according to \texttt{SortSpec2}, and then the results associated with the first grouping in the \texttt{SortSpec2}-ordering are returned. These results are ordered according to \texttt{SortSpec1}. Then the next grouping in the \texttt{SortSpec2}-ordering is chosen and its associated results are returned according to \texttt{SortSpec1}-ordering, etc. Both \texttt{SortSpec1} and \texttt{SortSpec2} can be the simple sort specs \texttt{asc/desc} or they can be lists of the fine-grained specs of the form \texttt{asc(i)/desc(i)}.

Example:

\begin{verbatim}
q(a,a,r(z,1)). q(a,a,r(g,2)). q(b,b,r(b,2)). q(b,b,r(d,3)).
q(b,b,r(d,3)). q(b,c,r(d,3)). q(b,c,r(e,1)). q(e,e,r(k,3)).
q(e,e,s(k,4)). q(e,e,s(p,5)). q(e,e,s(p,5)). q(e,e,s(p,5)).
?- ?Y = setof{?Z[?X,?Q](\texttt{[asc(1),desc(2),desc(3)]},\texttt{[desc(1),asc(2)]})|q(?X,?Q,?Z)}.
\end{verbatim}

will produce this result:

\begin{verbatim}
?Y = [r(d,3), r(b,2)]
?X = b
?Q = b
?Y = [r(e,1), r(d,3)]
?X = b
?Q = c
?Y = [r(k,3), s(p,5), s(k,4)]
?X = e
?Q = e
\end{verbatim}
?Y = [r(z,1), r(g,2)]
?X = a
?Q = a

30.5 Aggregation and Set-Valued Methods

Aggregation is often used in conjunction with set-valued methods, and ERGO provides several shortcuts to facilitate this use. In particular, the operator \texttt{->->} collects all the values of the given method for a given object in a set. The semantics of these operators can be expressed by the following rules:

\[
\begin{align*}
\end{align*}
\]

Note that ?L in \texttt{?O[?M->->?L]} and \texttt{?O[|?M->->?L|]} is a list of oids.

The special meaning for \texttt{->->} implies that this construct cannot appear in the head of a rule. One other caveat: recursion through aggregation is not supported and can produce incorrect results.

Sets collected in the above manner often need to be compared to other sets. For this, ERGO provides another the primitive \texttt{+>>}. A statement of the form \texttt{o[+>>s]} is true if the list of all values of the attribute \texttt{m} for object \texttt{o} contains every element in the list \texttt{s}. A statement of the form \texttt{o[|m+>>s|]} is true if \texttt{s} is the list of all values of \texttt{m} on the object \texttt{o}, which are obtained by inheritance from the superclasses of \texttt{o}.

For instance, the following query tests whether all Mary’s children are also John’s children:

\[
?- \text{Mary[children->->?L]}, \text{John[children+>>?L]}. 
\]

As with \texttt{->->}, the use of \texttt{+>>} is restricted to rule bodies.

31 Control Flow Statements

ERGO supports a number of control statements that are commonly used in procedural languages. These include \texttt{if \ then \ else} and a number of looping constructs.

31.1 If-Then-Else

This is the usual conditional control flow construct supported by most programming languages. For instance,
?- \if (foo(a),foo2(b)) \then (abc(?X),cde(?Y)) \else (qpr(?X),rts(?Y)).

Here the system first evaluates foo(a),foo2(b) and, if true, evaluates abc(?X),cde(?Y). Otherwise, it evaluates qpr(?X),rts(?Y). Note that \if, \then, and \else bind stronger than the conjunction ";", the disjunction ";", etc. This is why the parentheses are needed in the above example.

The abbreviated if-then construct is also supported. However, it should be mentioned that ERGO gives a different semantics to if-then than Prolog does. In Prolog,

...; (Cond -> Action), Statement, ...

fails if Cond fails and Statement is not executed. If the knowledge engineer wants such a conditional to succeed even if Cond fails, then (Cond->Action; \true) must be used. Our experience shows, however, that it is the latter form that is used in most cases in Prolog programming, so in ERGO the conditional

...; \if Cond \then Action, Statement, ...

succeeds even if Cond fails and Statement is executed next. To fail when Cond fails, one should explicitly use else: \if Cond \then Action \else \false. More precisely:

- \if Cond \then Action fails if and only if Cond succeeds but Action fails.
- \ifCond \then Action \else Alternative succeeds if and only if Cond and Action both succeed or Cond fails while Alternative succeeds.

The form if-then also has the following alternative forms: -->and <--.

Note that the if-statement is friendly to transactional updates in the sense that transactional updates executed as part of an if-statement would be undone on backtracking, unless the changes done by such updates are explicitly committed using the commit method of the system module \db (see Section 48.2).

31.2 Yet another If-Then-Else

There is a faster version of If-Then and If-Then-Else, but it is permitted only if the If-condition is a builtin primitive, a non-tabled Prolog predicate, or a predicate/method prefixed with the %-sign. In that case, the if-statement can be written as

\textit{if-condition -->} then-part
Apart from the restrictions on the if-condition, this differs from \texttt{if if-condition then then-part} in that \(\rightarrow\) is false if \texttt{if-condition} is false (regardless of \texttt{then-part}) while \texttt{if if-condition then then-part} is true/false if and only if \texttt{then-part} is true/false.

The fast If-Then-Else version has this form:

\begin{verbatim}
(if-condition \rightarrow\rightarrow then-part ; else-part)
\end{verbatim}

If has the same semantics as \texttt{if if-condition then then-part else else-part}, but is faster and has restrictions on \texttt{if-condition}, as explained above.

### 31.3 Loops

- **unless-do.** This construct is an abbreviation of \texttt{if Cond then true else Action}. If \texttt{Cond} is true, it succeeds without executing the action. Otherwise, it executes \texttt{Action} and succeeds or fails depending on whether \texttt{Action} succeeds or fails.

#### 31.3.1 The while-do and do-until Loops

These loops are similar in intent to those in C, Java, and other procedural languages. In \texttt{while Condition do Action}, \texttt{Condition} is evaluated before each iteration. If it is true, \texttt{Action} is executed. This statement succeeds even if \texttt{Condition} fails at the very beginning. The only case when this loop fails is when \texttt{Condition} succeeds, but \texttt{Action} fails (for all possible instantiations).

The loop \texttt{do Action until Condition} is similar, except that \texttt{Condition} is evaluated after each iteration. Thus, \texttt{Action} is guaranteed to execute at least once.

These loops work by backtracking through \texttt{Condition} and terminate when all ways to satisfy them have been exhausted (or when \texttt{Action} fails). The loop condition should not be modified inside the loop body. If it is modified (e.g., new facts are inserted in a predicate that \texttt{Condition} uses), it is not guaranteed that the changes will be seen during backtracking and thus the result of such a loop is indeterminate. If you need to modify \texttt{Condition}, use the statements \texttt{while-loop} and \texttt{loop-until} described below. Examples:

\begin{verbatim}
p({1,2,3}).
?- \texttt{while p(?X) do writeln(?X)@plg.}
?- \texttt{do (p(?X),writeln('loop executed for'=?X)@io) until \texttt{not p(?X)}.}
\end{verbatim}

For the second loop above, note that \texttt{?X} must be bound at the time the until-condition is checked. When negating conditions under \texttt{until}, caution should be exercised. For instance, something like
would not have worked: the loop would execute only once because `\naf p(?X)` will succeed on the first check (since `?X` is unbound, `\naf p(?X)` is undefined, and in loop conditions “undefined” is treated as a successful test).

The above loop statements have special semantics for transactional updates. Namely, changes done by these types of updates are committed at the end of each iteration. Thus, if `Condition` fails, the changes done by transactional updates that occur in `Cond` are undone. Likewise, if `Action` fails, backtracking occurs and the corresponding updates are undone. However, changes made by transactional update statements during the previous iteration remain committed. If the current iteration finishes then its changes will also remain committed regardless of what happens during the next iteration.

**Subtleties related to the loop conditions.** In both of the above loops, `Condition` should normally be user-defined backtrackable predicate. The use of non-backtrackable predicates as conditions requires special care, as described below.

First, not all non-backtrackable Prolog predicates fail when their work is done. For instance, `file_read_line_atom/2`, which reads files line-by-line, fails at the end, but `read/1` and `read/2` do not. Instead, they return the atom `end_of_file` when done. Therefore, `read(?X)@\prolog` or `read(?X)@\io` can never be a condition in the above loops; use `(read(?X)@\prolog, ?X \== end_of_file)` instead.

Second, non-backtrackable predicates, like `file_read_line_atom` and `read`, will fail if they are backtracked over. Therefore, if they are used as conditions in the `while-do` or `do-until` loops, they will execute only once. Fortunately, ERGO provides a way to use such predicates in the above loops by wrapping them with the `\repeat` hint. For instance (where we use ERGO’s equivalents for `file_read_line_atom`, `open`, and `close`),

```prolog
?- myfile[open(read) -> ?Stream]@\io,  
  \while \repeat(?Stream[line(atom,?Line)]@\io) \do writeln(?Line)@\io,  
  ?Stream[close]@\io.
```

Third, for the `do-until` loop, the loop quits immediately after the condition becomes true. Therefore, if one wants to use non-backtrackable predicates like `file_read_line_atom` or `read` (or their ERGO equivalents like `?Stream[line(atom,?Line)]@\io`) then they must be negated. For instance,

```prolog
q({1,2,3,4,5}).
?- myfile[open(read) -> ?Stream]@\io,
```
\do (q(?X), writeln('loop executed for X'=?X)@\io)
\until \repeat(\+ (?Stream[readline(atom,?Line)], writeln(?Line))@\io),
?Stream[close]@\io.

If \textit{myfile} has 5 or more lines, this loop will execute 5 times and then fail. If \textit{myfile} has less than 5 lines, the loop will execute once per line and then succeed.

Observe that \texttt{\texttt{naif}} should \textit{never} be used with non-logical conditions like the above, especially if these conditions are called with unbound variables.

### 31.3.2 The while-loop and loop-until Loops

This pair of loop statements is similar to \texttt{while-do} and \texttt{do-until}, except that transactional updates are \textit{not} committed after each iteration. Thus, failure of a statement following such a loop can cause all changes made by the execution of the loop to be undone. In addition, \texttt{while-loop} and \texttt{loop-until} do not work through backtracking. Instead, they execute as long as \texttt{Condition} stays true in \texttt{while-loop} loops and until it becomes true in \texttt{loop-until} loops. Therefore, the intended use of these loop statements is that \texttt{Action} in the loop body must modify \texttt{Condition} and, eventually, make it false (for instance, by deleting objects or tuples from some predicates mentioned in \texttt{Condition}) or true, in case of \texttt{loop-until}.

As in the case of the previous two loops, \texttt{while-loop} and \texttt{loop-until} succeed even if \texttt{Condition} is false (\texttt{while-loop}) or is true (\texttt{loop-until}) right from the outset. The only case when these loops fail is when \texttt{Action} fails — see below for the ways to avoid this (i.e., to continue executing the loop even when \texttt{Action} fails) and the possible pitfalls.

The statements \texttt{while-loop} and \texttt{loop-until} are more expensive (both time- and space-wise) than \texttt{while-do} and \texttt{do-until}. Therefore, they should be used only when truly transactional updates are required. In particular, such loops are rarely used with non-transactional updates.

**Subtleties related to the while-loop and loop-until statements.** Observe that \texttt{while-loop} and \texttt{loop-until} assume that the condition in the loop is being updated inside the loop body. Therefore, the condition must \textit{not} contain tabled predicates. If such predicates are involved in the loop condition, the loop is likely to continue forever.

Also, keep in mind that in any of the four loop statements, if \texttt{Action} fails, the loops terminate and are evaluated to \textit{false}. Therefore, if the intention is that the loop should continue even if \texttt{Action} fails, use the

\[(\text{Action ; \texttt{\texttt{true}}})\]
idiom in the loop body. In case of while-do and do-until, continuing execution of the loop is not a problem, because these loops work by backtracking through Condition and the loop will terminate when there are no more ways to backtrack. However, while-loop and loop-until have a potential pitfall. The problem is that these loops will continue as long as there is a way to satisfy Condition. If condition stays true, the loop runs forever. Therefore, as mentioned above, the while-loop/loop-until loops must make sure that Condition is modified by Action. Thus, if Action has non-transactional updates, the user must arrange that if Action fails then Condition is modified appropriately anyway for, otherwise the loop will never end. If Action is fully transactional and it fails, then using the (Action ; \text{true}) idiom in the loop body will definitely make the loop not terminate, so the use of this idiom in the body of while-loop and loop-until is dangerous if there is a possibility that Action will fail, and this idiom is useless if the action is expected to always succeed.

32  Constraint Solving

\(\mathcal{E}\text{RGO}\) provides an interface to constraint solving capabilities of the underlying Prolog engine. Currently XSB supports linear constraint solving over the domain of real numbers (CLPR). To pass a constraint to a constraint solver in the body of a \(\mathcal{E}\text{RGO}\) rule (or query), simply include it inside curly braces.

Here is a 2-minute introduction to CLPR. Try the following:

\begin{verbatim}
?- insert{p(1),p(2),p(3)}.
?- ?X>1, ?X<5, p(?X).
\end{verbatim}

Traditional logic languages, like Prolog, would give an error in response to this query. \(\mathcal{E}\text{RGO}\) is actually pretty good in this respect, as it will delay the inequalities until they can be solved. So, it will return two answers: 2 and 3. But what if we ask \(\mathcal{E}\text{RGO}\) to solve an equation:

\begin{verbatim}
?- insert{p(1),p(2),p(3),p(9)}.
\end{verbatim}

That \(\mathcal{E}\text{RGO}\) cannot do without the help of \textit{Constraint Logic Programming}. Constraint logic programming takes the view that \(?X=?Y*?Z, \ ?Y>1, \ ?Z>2\) is a a constraint on the set of solutions of the query \(p(?X)\). This approach allows Prolog to return meaningful answers to the above query by solving this constraint. However, the user must explicitly tell \(\mathcal{E}\text{RGO}\) which view to take: the traditional view that treats arithmetic built-ins as infinite predicates or the one that treats them as constraints. This latter view is indicated by enclosing constraints in curly braces. Thus, the above program becomes:
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?- insert{p(1),p(2),p(3),p(9)}.

?X = 9
?Y = 2
?Z = 4.5000

?X = 9
?Y = 3
?Z = 3.0000

Note the use of curly braces in the above example: they are essential in order to tell the system that you want constraints to be solved rather than checked.

33 Low-level Predicates

Unadulterated Prolog predicates. Sometimes it is useful to define predicates that are handled directly by the underlying Prolog engine. Such predicates would be represented as Prolog, not HiLog predicates. They are visible to HiLog queries, are not tabled automatically, and they are indexed as any other Prolog predicate. One use of such predicates, as sensors, is described in Section 34.

To support this feature, ERGO provides two directives:

```prolog
:- prolog{predname/arity, predname/arity, ...}.
:- table{predname/arity, predname/arity, ...}.
```

The first directive defines a predicate of a certain arity as a Prolog predicate to be handled directly by Prolog. If this predicate is defined recursively, it might need to be tabled to help with termination or to reduce computational complexity. This is accomplished with the help of the second directive. The `table` directive implies the `prolog` directive, however, so there is no need for the former in that case.

As mentioned above, predicates declared with the `prolog` directive are not visible to HiLog queries. For instance, in

```prolog
:- prolog{foo/2}.
?- ?X(? ,??).
```

the variable ?X will not be bound to foo.
The names of the predicates defined via the prolog directive are scrambled so there is no fear of a clash with Prolog builtins or :- prolog{...}-defined predicates in other ERGO modules.

At present prolog predicates are automatically exported and there is no way to encapsulate them in a module. To refer to a prolog predicate defined in a different module, e.g., predicate foo/1 in module bar, the following idiom can be used:

```prolog
:- prolog{foo/1}.

... ...

... :- ..., foo(?X)@bar, ...
```

Note that there are no executable prolog or table directives (i.e., invocable via ?– or from the ERGO shell).

The prolog and table directives in multi-file modules. Recall from Section 16.5 that a module can consist of several files: the first file would be normally loaded into the module and the subsequent files are added. Once a prolog or table directive is issued, it affects the compilation of the corresponding predicate symbols. The files added after the file that contains the initial prolog/table directives must include the necessary prolog directives, if that uses the affected predicate symbols. If this is not done, the system would issue an error, to prevent hard-to-find error from creeping into the knowledge base. It should be noted, however, that if a file with prolog declarations (e.g., :- prolog{p/1} or :- table{p/1}) is loaded into a module, foo, that declaration is automatically made available to the ERGO shell. So, such predicates are readily accessible from the shell (e.g., as p(?X)@foo).

The \nontabled_module directive. For simple modules that do not have recursive rules, significant amount of main memory can be saved by telling ERGO to not table predicates and methods. This is especially useful for modules that process large amounts of data and can be done by placing the following directive in the module file:

```prolog
:- \nontabled_module.
```

34 Sensors: Predicates with Restricted Invocation Patterns

Sometimes it is useful to define predicates that have fixed invocation patterns: the requirements that certain arguments must be bound (non-variable) or be ground. ERGO provides special support

---

16 Note: subsequently added files need only the prolog directives—even for predicates that are declared with a table directive.
for this kind of predicates, which are called \textit{sensors}. Namely, if a predicate is registered as a sensor, \textsc{Ergo} will monitor the binding pattern of that predicate and, if the predicate is called before the binding conditions are fulfilled, it will delay the predicate until the conditions are fulfilled. If at some point \textsc{Ergo} determines that the binding condition \textit{cannot} be satisfied, \textsc{Ergo} will call the sensor anyway. The sensor’s implementation can then examine the state of the argument bindings and issue an error, if appropriate.

The overall scenario for sensor use is as follows:

- Sensors are \textit{used} and \textit{defined} in separate files. Sensors must also be \textit{declared}. Declaration is done via the \texttt{defsensor} directive; definitions are done by means of the regular rules.

- A sensors can be defined in a \texttt{.P} file using the Prolog syntax (P-sensors) or in \texttt{.ergo} files using the \textsc{Ergo} syntax (F-sensors). P-sensors can also be defined as external modules in the C language. Usually all sensor declarations are collected in one \texttt{.ergo} file, which should be loaded into a separate \textsc{Ergo} module. That \texttt{.ergo} file should also contain the rules that define F-sensors.

- \textsc{Ergo} files containing sensor definitions \textit{cannot} be added to another \textsc{Ergo} module (e.g., loaded using the \texttt{add{...}} command).

- There are no restrictions on how sensors are to be defined. For instance, they can be recursive. However, there are certain conventions to abide by for P-sensors.

- Sensors are \textit{used} in modules \textit{other} than those where they are defined. To \textit{use} a sensor in a file, it has to be declared in that file with the \texttt{usesensor} directive.

However, if a file with a \texttt{usesensor} declaration is loaded into some module, all files that are \textit{compiled} in the same \textsc{Ergo} session and then \textit{added} into the same module will inherit that declaration. In that case, no explicit \texttt{usesensor} declaration is needed. However, if the file being added is compiled in a different \textsc{Ergo} session (which does not have the requisite \texttt{usesensor} declarations loaded) then explicit \texttt{usesensor} declarations are required.

- \textsc{Ergo} also provides executable versions of the directives \texttt{defsensor} and \texttt{usesensor}.

In most cases, the developer would choose F-sensors. There are two slight advantages in choosing to define a sensor as a P-sensor, however: the encapsulation provided by Prolog modules or if the sensor is implemented completely in C.

\textbf{Declaring a sensor.} There are two forms of the \texttt{defsensor} directive. The first is used for P-sensors (defined in \texttt{.P} files in Prolog or in \texttt{.c} files in C); the second is used for F-sensors (defined using \textsc{Ergo} syntax in \texttt{.ergo} files).
```prolog
:- defsensor{sens1(?Y,?X), sensorfoo, (nonvar(?X),ground(?Y))}. // P-sensor
:- defsensor{sens2(?Y,?X), (ground(?X),ground(?Y))}. // F-sensor
```

The first argument is a sensor invocation template. The last argument is a guard: a Boolean combination of \texttt{nonvar/1} and \texttt{ground/1} predicates applied to the input variables of the sensor. The sensor will be \textit{delayed} by the \texttt{ERGO} engine until the guard is satisfied (or until the engine determines that the guard cannot be satisfied).

In the first \texttt{defsensor} directive, which applies only to P-sensors, the middle argument is the name of the Prolog module in which the P-sensor is defined. In our case, \texttt{sens1} is declared as a P-sensor in the Prolog module \texttt{sensorfoo}. In that case, \texttt{ERGO} will expect those rules to be in a file named \texttt{sensorfoo.P} (or \texttt{sensorfoo.c}, if the sensor is defined as an external C module) and that file should be found somewhere on the \texttt{ERGO} search path (e.g., in the current directory).

**Defining an F-sensor.** The F-sensor \texttt{sens2} above is declared using a two-argument \texttt{defsensor} directive, so its definition is expected to be in a .\texttt{ergo} file and then loaded into a separate \texttt{ERGO} module. Here is an example of such a definition:

```prolog
sens2(abc,cde) :- !, writeln(details=\?F+\?L)@io.

sens2(?X,?Y) :-
\begin{verbatim}
  if \+ground(?X) // only ?X must be ground
  then
    abort(['In file ', \?F, ', line ', \?L, ': ',
           'Instantiation error in arg 3 in sens2'])@sys,
    ?Y \is ?X/2,
    writeln(Y=?Y)@prolog,
    sens2(abc,cde).
\end{verbatim}
```

The above rules are quite standard except for the quasi-variables \?F and \?L. When these quasi-variables occur in the body of a sensor definition, \?F is replaced with the file name from which the sensor was called; the quasi-variable \?L is replaced with the line number in the file where the call to the sensor occurred. A typical use of these quasi-variables is to report errors or issue warnings in case the sensor guard is not satisfied at the time the sensor is called, as illustrated in the above example. If these quasi-variables are used outside of a sensor definition, they are treated as new unbound variables.

**Defining an P-sensor.** From the perspective of the user, the above P-sensor \texttt{sens1} is a binary predicate. However, from the perspective of the developer, a P-sensor has two “hidden” extra arguments. These arguments are automatically pre-pended by the compiler to the list of the arguments that the user specified in a \texttt{defsensor} directive.
In any actual call (in a .ergo file) to a P-sensor, the first argument will always be bound (at compile time) to the file in which the sensor is used and the second argument will be bound to the line number on which the call to the sensor occurs. This is done to make it possible to define sensors so that they would issue useful runtime errors to enable the user to quickly locate the offending call. Thus, in the actual rules that define a P-sensor, the first two arguments to the sensor must be distinct variables, and this is the responsibility of the P-sensor developer. The remaining arguments are up to the developer to choose.

The upshot of the above is that to define sens1 one uses a predicate of arity 4, not 2. Here is an example of a definition for sens1 in a Prolog file sensorfoo.P. As we have just explained, the actual predicate to be defined here must be sens1 and its first two arguments must be distinct variables reserved for file names and line numbers (Prolog variables F and L).

```prolog
:- export sens1/4.
sens1(F,L,X,Y) :-
  (var(X) ;// X must be nonvar
   -> abort(["In file ", F, ", line ", L, ": ",
             'Instantiation error in arg 1 in sens1/2'])
   ; +ground(Y) ;// Y must be ground
   -> abort(["In file ", F, ", line ", L, ": ",
             'Instantiation error in arg 2 in sens1/2'])
  ),
  Z \is X+Y,
  writeln(z=Z).
```

It should be noted that F-sensors are also internally represented by predicates that have two extra arguments. However, the transformations that add these arguments are done by the ERGO compiler completely transparently to both the users and the developers of F-sensors.

**Using a sensor.** When sensors are used in ERGO modules (which are different from the modules where the sensors are defined), they must be declared using the `usesensor` directive. For instance,

```prolog
:- usesensor{sens1/2, sens2/2}.
```

Note that if the definition of a sensor is recursive, tabling might be needed in order to ensure termination. In a .P file, this is done using the usual Prolog `table` directive. ERGO provides a similar directive for sensors defined in .ergo files:

```prolog
:- table{sens2/2}.
```
This directive is to be placed in the file that contains the rules defining the sensor and the number of arguments must match the number used in the F-sensor declaration. It must come after the defsensor directive. For P-sensors, the arity must match the number of arguments used in the sensor definition, i.e.,

```prolog
:- table{ sens1/4 }.
```

Sensors are viewed as low-level non-logical predicates, analogous to builtins, so they are not visible to HiLog queries. For instance, neither

```prolog
?- ?X(?,?,?,?).
```

nor

```prolog
?- ?X(?,
```

would bind ?X to sens1 or sens2 (cf. Section 33).

### 35 Rearranging the Order of Subgoals at Run Time

Sometimes certain subgoals should be executed only if certain arguments are bound or ground and should be delayed otherwise. The reason for this might be correctness or efficiency of the execution. Since it may be impossible to know at compile time when the requisite arguments become bound, one might want to place the relevant subgoals as early as possible to the left and then wait until the binding conditions become true. Once they become true, the affected subgoals can be executed. If the binding condition never becomes true, then we can have two possible actions: abort or execute the subgoals anyway.

ERGO supports this mode of goal rearranging via delay quantifiers. A delay quantifier has one of these forms:

```prolog
must ( Condition )
wish ( Condition )
```

where \( \text{Condition} \) consists of the terms of the form \( \text{ground}(\text{?Var}) \) and \( \text{ground}(\text{?Var}) \) connected with “,” (or and) and “;” (or or). If parentheses are not used in \( \text{Condition} \), then the comma is considered to bind stronger than the semicolon.

Delay quantifiers are connected via the operator \( \wedge \) to the actual goal that is to be executed with possible delay. The goal can be a simple frame or a predicate, or it can be a more complex goal of any kind that is allowed to appear in the rule bodies. In the latter case, the goal has to be enclosed inside parentheses. A subgoal with an attached delay quantifier is called a delayable subgoal and
the regular subgoal part in a delayable subgoal is said to be *controlled* by the quantifiers. So, the general syntax is

\[ \text{delay-quantifier}^\ast \text{delay-quantifier}^\ast \ldots ^\ast \text{Goal} \]

Delayable subgoals can be nested and multiple delay quantifiers can be attached to the same goal. For instance,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{must}(&\text{ground}(?X) \text{ or } \text{nonvar}(?Y))^\ast X[foo->?Y] \\
\text{wish}(&\text{ground}(?X) \text{ and } \text{ground}(?Y); \text{nonvar}(?Z))^\ast \text{p(?X), } foo[\text{bar(?Y)->?Z}] \\
\text{wish}(&\text{ground}(?X) \text{ or } \text{ground}(?Y))^\ast \text{must}(\text{nonvar}(?Z))^\ast \\
& \text{(p(?X), wish(\text{nonvar}(?W)))^\ast q(?W), } foo[\text{bar(?Y)->?Z}] \\
\end{align*}
\]

When a delayable subgoal is to be executed, the attached delay quantifiers are checked. If at least one the quantifiers is not satisfied (i.e., if its condition is not satisfied) then the goal is not executed, but is delayed instead until such time that all the quantifiers are satisfied or the engine determines that satisfying all the quantifiers is impossible. In the above example, the first goal would be delayed if ?X is non-ground and ?Y is an unbound variable. The second delayable subgoal has a more complex execution condition and it controls a more complex subgoal, the conjunction of \text{p(?X)} and \text{foo[bar(?Y)->?Z]}. This subgoal will be delayed if either ?X or ?Y is non-ground and ?Z is an unbound variable. The third delayable subgoal is even more complex. First, it involves two delay quantifiers; second, it controls a complex subgoal that is a conjunction of three other subgoals, and one of them is itself a delayable subgoal. This complex delayable subgoal will be executed immediately only if ?X or ?Y are ground and ?Z is not a variable. Otherwise, it will be delayed. But when the controlled subgoal is eventually ready for execution, its middle part, \text{wish(\text{nonvar}(?W)))^\ast q(?W), } might still be delayed if ?W is an unbound variable.

When a delayable subgoal is delayed, its attached quantifiers are periodically checked for satisfaction. If the first (leftmost) quantifier is satisfied, the controlled subgoal is executed. If this subgoal still has a controlling delay quantifier, then this quantifier’s condition will be checked, etc. At some point during the execution, the inference engine might stumble upon a delayed subgoal and determine (provably!) that its first delay quantifier is not satisfiable any more, i.e., subsequent execution will not be able to bind the variables in that quantifier in the required way. In this case, the cause of action depends on the type of the quantifier. If the unsatisfied quantifier is a \text{wish}-quantifier, then the controlled subgoal is executed anyway: the unsatisfied delay condition was only a “wish.” If, however, the unsatisfied quantifier is a \text{must}-quantifier, the execution of the subgoal is aborted and the error message will indicate which \text{must}-condition was at fault. To illustrate this on an example, consider the following delayable subgoal issued as a query against a knowledge base that contains the listed facts:

\[
p(1).
\]
foo[bar(2)->3].
?- must(ground(?X) or ground(?Y))\^wish(nonvar(?Z))\^ (p(?X), must(nonvar(?W))\^q(?W), foo[bar(?Y)->?Z]),
?X=1.

When the subgoal is first encountered, it is delayed because ?X and ?Y are not ground. Then the engine executes the subgoal ?X=1 and ?X gets bound to 1. The delay condition becomes satisfied, so the engine considers the subgoal

\[\text{wish(nonvar(?Z))} \edge\check{\text{p}}(?X), \text{must(nonvar(?W))} \edge\check{\text{q}}(?W), \text{foo[bar(?Y)->?Z]}\]

Clearly, ?Z will not be bound if the engine continues delaying the controlled subgoal, so it must decide on the final disposition for this delayable subgoal. Since the delayable subgoal is controlled by a wish-quantifier, the subgoal is executed despite the fact that the delay condition does not hold. During the execution, p(1) is satisfied, must(nonvar(?W))\^q(?W) gets delayed, and then foo[bar(?Y)->?Z] is satisfied. Now the disposition of the remaining delayed subgoal has to be decided. Since ?W cannot be bound any more and the controlling quantifier is of the must-variety, the engine will throw an error:

Goal: q(?A)
Condition: nonvar(?A)

**Forcing immediate execution of delayed subgoals.** Sometimes it is necessary to tell the system to stop delaying subgoals and force their immediate execution. For instance, in

\[- must(ground(?X) or ground(?Y))\^wish(nonvar(?Z))\^ (p(?X), wish(nonvar(?W))\^q(?W), foo[bar(?Y)->?Z]),\]
...,
...,
\[\text{test(?X,?Y,?Z,?W)}\].

the query test might be executed before the queries p(?X), q(?W), and foo[bar(?Y)->?Z], if some of the delay quantifiers remain unsatisfied. If instead we want to make sure that those queries are executed before test(?X,?Y,?Z,?W), Ergo provides the immediate execution operator, !!, which forces immediate execution of all the “reachable” delayable subgoals:

?- must(ground(?X) or ground(?Y))\^wish(nonvar(?Z))\^
(p(?X), wish(nonvar(?W))\^q(?W), foo[bar(?Y)->?Z]),
...,
...,
!!,
test(?X,?Y,?Z,?W).

In this example, the aforesaid queries will be executed before \texttt{test(?X,?Y,?Z,?W)}.

A delayed subgoal, $G$, is \textit{reachable} by an occurrence of the immediate execution operator $!!$ if $G$ is suspended on a ground/nonvar condition that involves a variable that appears in the the scope of the rule or the query where the aforesaid occurrence of $!!$ is found. What it means to be suspended on a variable is a little trickier. In the above example, if neither $?X$ nor $?Y$ is ground, then $p(?X), q(?W),$ and $foo[bar(?Y)->?Z])$ would be suspended on either $?X$ or $?Y$. If one of these variables becomes ground, then these queries would be suspended on $?Z$, if $?Z$ is still not bound. Once $?Z$ gets bound, then $p(?X)$ and $foo[bar(?Y)->?Z])$ will no longer be suspended, but $q(?W)$ will still be suspended on $?W$ unless $?W$ is already bound by that time.

Note, however, that $!!$ will not have any effect on subgoals that are suspended on variables that are not in the scope of the rule or query containing this immediate execution operator. For instance, in

\begin{verbatim}
p(?X) :- must(nonvar(?X))\^foo(?X,?Y), wish(ground(?Z))\^bar(?Z), moo(?Y,?X,?Z).
moo(?Y,?X,?Z) :- \ldots, !!, \ldots
?- p(?W), !!, writeln(?W)@\plg.
\end{verbatim}

the variable $?W$ is in scope for the query. Since $p(?W)$ unifies with the head of the first rule, $?W$ and $?X$ become the same variable. This means that $foo(?X,?Y)$ is reachable from $!!$ and will be forced to execute by that operator. In contrast, $bar(?Z)$ is suspended on the variable $?Z$, which is not in the scope of the query. Therefore, $bar(?Z)$ will not be forced to execute by the operator $!!$ in the above query. On the other hand, $?Z$ is in the scope of the second rule above, so the occurrence of $!!$ in \textit{that} rule will force the execution of $bar(?Z)$.

### 36 Rule Ids and Meta-information about Rules

Every rule in \texttt{ERGO}—whether it appears in a file, is inserted at run time, or is reified and lives as an object it its own right—is assigned a unique \textit{rule Id} and the user can also supply additional meta-data for it. The rule Id can be either given explicitly by the knowledge engineer or, if not given explicitly, is assigned by the system (at compile time for rules that live in files and at run time for inserted and reified rules).

A rule Id is a triple of the form $(\textit{local\_id}, \textit{file\_name}, \textit{module})$, where
• **local_id** is a term that is either explicitly given to the rule by the author or is generated by the compiler or loader.

• **file_name** is the *local* file name where the rule occurs. The name does *not* include the directory part, but it *does* include the name extensions (e.g., *foo.ergo*). The #include commands are taken into account, so if a rule is found in file *foo* that is #included in file *bar* then the rule Id will use *foo*, not *bar*.

• **module** is the module into which the rule is loaded.

When the file name and the module part of a rule Id is clear or immaterial, we will sometimes refer to the local part of a rule Id as simply an “Id.”

For rules that are inserted dynamically at run time via an insert{...} or insertrule{...} statement, their file name is to be specified as dynrule(containing-file)@prolog, where containing-file is the local file name of the file that contains the insert statement in question. This also applies to rules found in files that are added (as opposed to loaded). For instance, consider the following file

```
// File: foo.ergo
@!{id1} p1 :- q1.
?- insert{@!{id2} p2 :- q2}.
```

If this file is loaded into the module *bar* then the first rule will have the full Id (id1,'foo.ergo',bar) and the second (id2,dynrule('foo.ergo')@prolog,bar), but if *foo.ergo* is *added* to *bar* then the first Id will be (id1,dynrule('foo.ergo')@prolog,bar) (and the second as before).

If a rule is inserted via the ERGO command line interface then the file component of the Id will be dynrule(?)@prolog, i.e., the file name component is a variable. For instance, if a rule like the following is inserted at a command prompt

```
ergo> insert{@!{id3} p3 :- q3}@bar.
```

then its Id is (id3,dynrule(?)@prolog,bar).

ERGO supports the use of rule descriptors of the form

• **Rule Id descriptor**: @!{id[frame]} or just @!{id}, where id is a term and the frame information is the same as what is allowed in a simple (not nested) frame. Some properties in the frame have special meaning as detailed below.

The rule Id descriptor is used to explicitly specify only the local id part of the rule Id, as described above. The other two components are assigned by the system. If no explicit rule Id is given, the system will generate one.
• **Tag descriptor:** The property `tag` indicates that the values of that property are rule tags, which are used in defeasible reasoning (Section 40). For instance,

```erlang
@!{abc[tag->\{tag1,tag2\},author->'kifer@cs.stonybrook.edu']} head :- body.
```

Here the rule is given an explicit rule Id, `abc`, and two tags, the terms `tag1` and `tag2`. The property `author` (as most others) is not special; it can be used for whatever purpose the user decides to use it.

Because rule tags are very common pieces of metadata, ERGO provides a convenient shortcut, which is used as a standalone descriptor. For instance, the following is equivalent to the previous descriptor:

```erlang
@\{tag1,tag2\} @!{abc[author->'kifer@cs.stonybrook.edu']} head :- body.
```

• **Defeasibility descriptor:** Defeasibility descriptors are used for defeasible reasoning, as described in Section 40. The descriptor `strict` means that the rule cannot be defeated by a higher-priority rule, and `defeasible` means it can be. These are Boolean properties in the descriptor frame and, as one may guess, only one of them can be specified for any given rule. For instance,

```erlang
@\{tag1,tag2\}
@!{abc[author->'kifer@cs.stonybrook.edu', defeasible]} head :- body.
```

Defeasibility descriptors are also fairly common and ERGO provides shortcuts for them as well. As with tags, these shortcuts are specified as standalone descriptors. For instance,

```erlang
@\{tag1,tag2\}
@@{defeasible}
@!{abc[author->'kifer@cs.stonybrook.edu']} head :- body.
```

Of course, we did not save any typing with the above defeasibility shortcut. However, this shortcut does improve the visibility of the fact that a particular rule is defeasible (or strict). Also, when no explicit Id and frame properties are specified and the user opts for the default rule Id, the defeasibility and the tag shortcuts save significant amount of typing. For instance,

```erlang
@\{tag1,tag2\} @@{defeasible} head :- body.
```

Without these shortcuts, the user would have to use the `current rule Id quasi-constant`, `@!`, which gets substituted for the Id of the rule in which it occurs:
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\{\text{tag}\rightarrow\{\text{tag1,tag2}\}, \text{defeasible}\}\text{ head :- body.}

In this case, \{\text{\textbackslash\textbackslash\textit{\textbackslash\textbackslash}}\} gets replaced by the default Id, which the system assigns to this rule.

The descriptors extend the rule syntax as follows:

\begin{verbatim}
rule-descriptors Head :- Body.
rule-descriptors Fact.
\end{verbatim}

Any number of tag descriptors is allowed but only one rule Id and one defeasibility descriptor. In other places, rule descriptors are either ignored or will cause syntax errors.

Rule tags and Ids are terms and so can have variables. For instance,

\{\text{allow}(\text{\textit{?Device},?Person})\} \text{ authorized(?Person,?Device) :- \text{\texttt{\textbackslash\textbackslash naf}} \text{ abused(?Person,?Device).}}

If no Id is given, a system-generated rule Id is used. If no tag is given, the Id of the rule also serves as a tag.

If no defeasibility descriptor is given then a rule is considered defeasible by default if an explicit tag is specified. Otherwise, the rule is considered strict. However, for defeasibility to have any effect, the rule must be in a defeasibility-capable document (local file or a remote document), i.e., the document must have the directive :- use_argumentation_theory at the top (see Section 40). Also, rules whose heads are transactional predicates or methods are currently never defeasible—no matter what the defeasibility descriptor says.

36.1 The Current Rule Id Quasi-constant

We have already seen a use of this quasi-constant earlier. In general, rules can reference their Ids even if the Id is not given explicitly by the author and thus cannot be determined by just looking at the rule. This is accomplished with the help of the special “current rule Id” quasi-constant \{\text{\textbackslash\textbackslash}\}. This quasi-constant gets replaced by the local part of the Id of the rule where the quasi-constant occurs. The replacement happens at compile time for the static rules and at run time for dynamic or reified rules. To get the file name part, use \{\text{\textbackslash\textbackslash\textbackslash\textbackslash\textbackslash F}\} and the module part use \{\text{\textbackslash\textbackslash\textbackslash\textbackslash\textbackslash}\}—the quasi-constants introduced in Section 7.6.

36.2 Enabling and Disabling Rules

Rule Ids make it possible to enable and disable rules, producing the effect of deleting and re-inserting rules. The difference is, however, that enabling and disabling do not actually change the rules in
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the system (so they are very fast compared to `insert` and `delete`) and, most importantly, they apply to static rules, not just the dynamic rules. To specify a rule, one needs to specify the local Id of the rule in question, the file name of the rule, and its module. For dynamic rules, the file name is `dynrule(containing-file)`, where `containing-file` is the file that contains the `insert...` or `inserrule...` statement that inserted the dynamic rule. The following primitives are provided:

- `enable{LocalId,File,Module}
- disable{LocalId,File,Module}
- tenable{LocalId,File,Module}
- tdisable{LocalId,File,Module}
- isenabled{LocalId,File,Module}
- isdisabled{LocalId,File,Module}

In the `enable/tenable` primitives, all arguments must be bound. The first two primitives are non-transactional, i.e., these operations will not be undone if the query in which they occur fails. The second two primitives, `tenable` and `tdisable`, are transactional. Their effects are undone on backtracking. For instance,

```
bbbb.
@!{r1} aaaa:-bbbb.
?- tdisable{r1,\@F,\@}, aaaa.
No
?- aaaa.
Yes
```

Here the first query disables the rule `r1` so `aaaa` becomes false and thus the entire query fails. Due to that, the disabling action is undone, so the rule remains enabled. Therefore, the second query succeeds.

The last two primitives are queries that tell us whether a particular rule is enabled or disabled. To enable or disable a rule, the rule must already exist as a static or dynamic rule. Enabling and disabling operations are idempotent: they always succeed and applying `enable` to an enabled rule or `disable` to a disabled rule has no effect. If a rule with the specified Id and module does not exist in the system, both `enable` and disable fail and so do both of the above queries.

All of the above primitives have a one-argument form, which is a shortcut for the three-argument version, where argument 2 is `\@F` and argument 3 is `\@`. For instance, `tenable{foo}` instead of `tenable{foo,\@F,\@}`.
The difference between disabling and deleting a rule. It is important to realize that disabling a rule, as described here, and deleting a rule, described in Section 28.3, are two very different operations, although there are similarities. For similarities, both operations take the affected rule(s) out of the reasoning process and the effect is as if the rule is “not there.” The major differences are:

1. Rule deletion works only for dynamic rules (those added with `insertrule`), while disabling works for all rules.

2. A deleted rule is physically removed from the system. A disabled rule is only marked as disabled. It can be re-enabled by supplying its Id and module as arguments to the `enable` primitive. In contrast, to re-instate a deleted rule, it must be re-inserted, which requires supplying the entire original rule as an argument. Disabling/enabling are very fast operations, while deleting/inserting a rule is much more expensive.

3. For multi-headed rules, there is another important difference. A multi-headed rule is one that has more than one literal in the head, which is equivalent to several single-headed rules. Such rules typically arise when a complex frame is put in a rule head. With a `deleterule` operation, one can delete just one of the heads, leaving the remainder of the rule intact. For instance, in

   ```prolog
   ?- insertrule{?X:person[name->?N] :- pred(?X,?N)}.  
   ?- deleterule{?X:person :- pred(?X,?N)}.  
   ```

   the `person[name->?N] :- pred(?X,?N)` part of the rule remains. In contrast, in

   ```prolog
   ?- insertrule{@!{abc} ?X:person[name->?N] :- pred(?X,?N)}.  
   ?- disable{abc,\@}.  
   ```

   the `disable`-primitive takes all parts of the rule out of circulation, while a subsequent matching `enable`-operation would reinstate the entire rule.

36.3 Changing the Defeasibility at Run Time

The defeasibility status of a rule can be changed via the following statements:

- `makedefeasible{Id,File,Module}`
- `makestrict{Id,File,Module}`
- `isdefeasible{Id,File,Module}`
• isstrict{Id,File,Module}

The last two primitives are queries. The primitive makedefeasible and makestrict are idempotent and always succeed. The queries isdefeasible and isstrict tell us whether the rule in question is currently defeasible or strict. If the rule with the given Id does not exist in the given module, both of these queries fail.

All of these primitives have a short, one-argument form, which is a shortcut for the three-argument version, where argument 2 is \@F and argument 3 is \@. For instance, makedefeasible{foo} instead of makedefeasible{foo, \@F, \@}.

### 36.4 Querying Rule Descriptors

Rule Ids and other rule descriptor data can be queried using the clause{...} and @!{...} constructs. The clause{...} construct was already introduced in Section 29. Now we introduce two new forms of this statement, which extend the statements defined in Section Section 29:

```
clause{descriptors head, body}
iclause{descriptors type, head, body}
```

Here descriptors are rule descriptors as above and type, head, and body are as in Section 29. For instance,

```
?- clause{@{?Tag @@{defeasible} foo[bar->?Val],?Body}.
```

This query will retrieve all defeasible rules whose head matches foo[bar->?Val]. The variable ?Tag will be bound to the tag of the rule.

**Note:** The clause{...} primitive queries the rules as they were created by the author. Disabling a rule or changing its defeasibility status won’t affect clause.... For instance, if we had a rule @!{abc} @{defeasible} p:- q and then this rule was disabled and/or made strict, clause@@{defeasible} p,q will still be true and clause@@{strict} p,q false. In this way, one can investigate the changes made to the status of the various rules in the course of time. □

The @!{...} construct is more convenient than the clause-construct and much more efficient, if one needs to query the descriptor data only, not the rule base. Inside the braces, this construct expects a usual frame formula of the form ruleId[prop₁, prop₂, ...], where propᵢ have the form attr->val or term. In the first case, the property is a regular attribute-value pair and in the second it is a Boolean property. Nested or composite frames are not allowed, but module specifications are supported, so one can query rule descriptors in another module. For instance,
Recall that in all the above examples, only the local part of the rule IDs was queried (cf. ?R in the queries above). To enable querying the file name and the module components of rule IDs, ERGO also provides the file and module properties. For instance,

?- @!{?R[foo->bar, tag->low, defeasible]}.  
?- @!{rule123[]@foo}.  
?- @!{?R[tag->high, strict, author->Bob]@foo}.

In addition, the type property can be used to find out whether a particular annotated statement is a rule or a latent query (see Section 37):

?- @!{statement43[type->?T, module->main]}.  

If the statement is a rule then ?T will get bound to rule; if it is a latent query then this variable gets bound to query.

### 36.5 Reserved Properties in Rule Descriptors

The following property names in rule descriptors or in rule descriptor queries (described in Section 36.4) are reserved:

- tag
- module
- file
- type
- defeasible
- strict

The properties module, file, and type are not allowed in rule descriptors (i.e., in @!{...} in rule heads)—only in rule descriptor queries (i.e., in @!{...} and clause{...} in rule bodies)—because they are assigned at compile or load time.
Latent Queries

Latent queries are a cross between queries and rules. From queries they borrow the main purpose: to query the knowledge base. From rules they borrow the ability to use descriptors (so, latent queries have IDs and, possibly, other meta-data) and the fact that such queries are not executed immediately. Instead, they are saved to be called on-demand some other time. Like rules, latent queries can also be inserted, deleted, enabled, disabled, and queries.

Latent queries are useful as integrity constraints and also in GUI development, but because these queries can have arbitrary properties attached to them via descriptors, they can be used for various other, specialized needs (e.g., as standing queries that are called periodically to update user views). At the same time, latent queries is an older mechanism, which is primarily retained for FLORA-2 and ERGOLite users. ERGO has newer, much more powerful mechanisms of integrity constraints and alerts.

A latent query has the following form:

\[
\text{descriptor} \ !- \ \text{query-body}.
\]

The descriptor part is mandatory and has the same form as the rule descriptors introduced in Section 36. The query-body part is the same as the body of a query. Thus, from regular queries the latent queries differ in that they have descriptors and they use !- instead of ?-. From rules, this new type of queries differs in that they have no heads and use !- instead of :-.

The main difference with queries, however, is the fact that latent queries, when they appear in a file, are not executed right away. Instead, they are saved and must be called explicitly by their query Id using the query{...} primitive. In order to get results from such a query, the query Id must have variables. For instance,

\[
p(1,2), p(2,3), p(3,4), p(2,4).
\]

\[
\Theta!\{\text{test}(?X,?Y)\} !- p(?X,?Z), p(?Z,?Y).
\]

\[
?- \ \text{query}\{\text{test}(?X,4),\Theta F,\Theta\}.
\]

\[
?X = 1
\]

\[
?X = 2
\]

(The quasi-constants \(\Theta F, \Theta\), and others were introduced in Section 7.6.) Observe that latent queries are executed using their IDs. This is different from rule invocation, which is done using the rule-head as a query. In the above, test(?X,4) is not a predicate and it does not interfere with any other rule (even with the ones that have test(?X,?Y) as head- or body-predicates!).
The following two forms are equivalent:

?- query{test(?X,4),\@F,\@}.
?- query{test(?X,4)}.

However, the above will work only if \query\{\ldots\} is invoked from the same file as the one where the corresponding latent query is defined because \@F is specific to a file and \@ is specific to a module. If the latent query is called from another file or from \ERGO shell (command line) then \@F cannot be used (and thus the 1-argument version of \query\{\ldots\} cannot be used either) because the quasi-constant \@F means “this file” and the files here are different (and the modules possibly also). The file-component to use in the 3-argument version of \query\{\ldots\} in this case depends on where the latent query came from. This is described in detail for rules in Section 36 and the case of latent queries is similar:

- If a latent query of the form @!id123 !- query was inserted (e.g., via insertrule\{\ldots\}) into a module bar through the \ERGO shell then the file component is dynrule(?)@\prolog and the invocation command for such a query would be

  \texttt{query{id123, dynrule(?)@\prolog, bar}}.

- If a latent query of the form @!id123 !- query appears in a file with a local name \texttt{foo.ergo} and this file is added to module bar then the file component would be \texttt{dynrule('foo.ergo')@\prolog} and the invocation command for such a query would be

  \texttt{query{id123, dynrule('foo.ergo')@\prolog, bar}}.

- If a latent query of the form @!id123 !- query appears in a file with a local name \texttt{foo.ergo} and this file is loaded into module bar then the file component would be just \texttt{'foo.ergo'} and the invocation command for the query would be

  \texttt{query{id123, 'foo.ergo', bar}}.

Latent queries can be inserted, deleted, enabled, and disabled using the same primitives as the ones used for rules:

?- insertrule{@!\{rr2(?X)[bar->4]\} !- q(?X), ?X<4}.
?- deleterule{@!\{rr2(?)[bar->?X]\} !- ?}.
?- enable{qq1(?), 'foobar.ergo',}.
?- tenable{qq1(?), ?F, ?M}.
?- disable{qq2(?), F,}.
?- tdisable{qq2(?)}.
Finally, like rules, latent queries can be themselves queried using the primitive **clause**... and the meta-query `@!`.... In the clause... primitive, the head part is ignored.

```
?- clause{@!{?X[type->query]} ?,?B}.

?X = rr1(?_h4115)
?B = (${p(?_h4115)@main}, ?_h4115 < 3)

?X = rr2(?_h4156)
?B = (${q(?_h4156)@main}, ?_h4156 < 4)

```

```
<erogo>
@!{?X[type->query]}.

?X = rr1(?_h3033)

?X = rr2(?_h3046)

```

Note the use of the **type** property in the descriptors of the above two queries. This is a special builtin descriptor property, which can be used only in rule bodies. The value of that property is **query** for latent queries and **rule** for rules.

### 38 Integrity Constraints

Database systems have a very useful notion, called **integrity constraint**. An integrity constraint is a logical statement that specifies a condition that must be maintained at all times regardless of the changes made to the knowledge base. We have seen two examples of integrity constraints in ERGO: type constraints and cardinality constraints. These particular constraints are dealt with in greater detail in Sections 45.2 and 45.3, but those sections deal with **type-checking**, i.e., with verifying that the knowledge base satisfies typing and cardinality constraints and with finding out what violates them. The primitives described in those sections must be invoked by the user *explicitly* each time a type-check is desired and then the knowledge base must be repaired manually. In this section, however, we are concerned with **automatic** maintenance of constraints: timely warning the user when a violation occurs in the cause of an update transaction and, if possible, rolling back the violating transaction. The primitives introduced in this section can be used in tandem with Sections 45.2 and 45.3 to enable automatic maintenance of typing and cardinality constraints.

Importantly, integrity constraints are **not** to be confused with **constraint solving** described in Section 32.

Conceptually, an integrity constraint is a query that is supposed to be **false** at all times and
this fact is ascertained automatically after every transaction in ERGO. If the query is true for some bindings of its arguments, each of those bindings should be viewed as a witness of an integrity violation. (Yes, normally people think of constraints as something that must always be true, not as something that must always be false, but constraints-as-false-statements—i.e., requiring that something must not happen—are more useful, since this produces the culprits responsible for constraint violation.)

To define an integrity constraint, one must first define a suitable predicate or a frame to be used as a constraint. For instance, suppose that it is not allowed to both receive a salary from a company and also be a consultant for it:

```
// A Conflict Of Interest (COI) constraint:
// it should NOT be the case that, for some binding p for ?Person,
// some binding c for ?Company, and some binding s for ? (the salary
// argument) both salary(p,c,s) and consults(p,c) are true.
```

If it so happens that someone called John both works and consults for Acme, Inc., i.e., that something like `salary(John,Acme,100000)` and `consults(John,Acme)` both become true, we would like to know this immediately and, if possible, the transaction that introduced this violation should be rolled back.

If automatic maintenance of this constraint is what we want, the second step is to tell ERGO about this want by executing this command:

```
?- +constraint{COI(?,?)}. // activate constraint
```

The plus sign says that we want to activate the aforesaid query as an integrity constraint; the minus sign is used when we want to deactivate a constraint:

```
?- -constraint{COI(?,?)}. // deactivate constraint
```

The first argument of `constraint{...}` must be a HiLog predicate or a frame. It can also be `\neg` of a predicate or a frame, but it cannot be a `\naf`, conjunction, disjunction, or any kind of more complex subgoals.

Once a constraint is activated, it is first checked against the current knowledge base. If it is not violated (i.e., the constraint query is false), everything is good. Otherwise, a warning is issued. For instance, suppose John and Mary do work and also consult for Acme. Then the following warning will be triggered after the above `+constraint{...}` statement is executed:

```
*** A violation of the constraint activated on line 5 in file mykb.ergo
```
existed prior to adding this constraint
The offending instances of the constraint are:
   COI(John,Acme)
   COI(Mary,Acme)

In this case, the violation existed prior to the moment the constraint was activated, so there is little
one can do automatically. Although a number of theoretical approaches to resolving such situations
exist, their practical value is questionable. The practical approach offered by ERGO is to use Studio
and ask for an explanation for each of the instances of the query that indicates a violation. Then
one can decide what to do (perhaps the fact that John consults for Acme was supposed to be, but
was not, deleted once he was hired by Acme as an employee). If, on the other hand, it is known
how to resolve a particular constraint automatically then constraints with callbacks (described
later) might be the way to go. Another way to resolve constraints automatically is to always use
transactional updates (Section 27.2), as shown next.

Suppose the knowledge base has only the fact \texttt{consults(Bob,GroupLTD)} but not any fact of
the form \texttt{salary(Bob,GroupLTD,...)}, i.e., \texttt{mykb.ergo} is like this:

\begin{verbatim}
   consults(Bob,GroupLTD).
   ?- +constraint{COI(?),(?)}.
\end{verbatim}

Suppose that next we execute the transaction

\begin{verbatim}
   ?- tinsert{salary(Bob,GroupLTD,200000)}.
\end{verbatim}

If this insertion is to be performed, the knowledge base would get a constraint violation and so the
following warning is going to be issued:

\begin{verbatim}
*** A violation of the constraint activated on line 3 in file mykb.ergo
    is detected after the transaction t_insert{salary(Bob,GroupLTD,100000)}

   The offending instances of the constraint are:
   COI(Bob,GroupLTD)
\end{verbatim}

If we now check the query \texttt{salary(Bob,GroupLTD,?Salary)} then we will see that it has \textit{no} answers,
i.e., the offending insertion was rolled back! This magic happened because we used \textit{transactional}
insertion, \texttt{tinsert} (or, synonymously, \texttt{t_insert}) — see Section 27.2 for the details. If we used
a \textit{non}-transactional insertion, such as \texttt{insert(salary(Bob,GroupLTD,100000))}, then the above
warning would also appear, but the insertion would stick and the user would have to resolve the
issue manually afterwards.

If a constraint is no longer needed, it can be deactivated:
?- ~constraint{COI(?,?)}.  

After this, John, Bob, and Mary can both work and consult for Acme and other companies at the same time—with no conflict of interest questions asked.

**Unresolved constraint violations.** Note that if constraint violations are not resolved, ERGO will keep reminding about them when new update transactions are executed whether these transactions add new violations or not. In contrast, queries that produce no change to the underlying state of the knowledge base will not trigger such warnings, even if violations exist prior to the query execution—to reduce the annoyance factor.

For instance, suppose that Mary and John violate the conflict of interests constraint and a new transaction added a COI for Bob with respect to GroupLTD. Then the warning will be

```
... ... ...
    The offending instances of the constraint are:
    COI(John,Acme)
    COI(Mary,Acme)
    COI(Bob,GroupLTD)
```

If the user does not want to be reminded about the old violations then, perhaps, an integrity constraint is not the right tool for the situation at hand. After all, what is the purpose of an integrity *constraint* if the violations of the constraint are not being resolved? To address this type situations, ERGO provides a different mechanism, called *truth*-type *alerts*, described in Section 39. This is a more computationally expensive mechanism than constraints and so it should be used only if resolving constraint violations is not always desirable or when the conditions being checked are not conceptualized as integrity constraints that must not be violated.

**Constraints with callbacks.** Sometimes, the knowledge engineer might need to take a programmatic action in response to a constraint violation. In most of the previous examples, constraint violations were reported in print and manual intervention was needed to take a corrective action. To let the user specify programmatic corrective actions, ERGO provides a 2-argument version of the `+constraint{...}` primitive:

```
+constraint{ConstraintQuery,CallbackPredicate}.
```

The callback predicate must be a HiLog predicate with at least one argument; it can be also a `\neg` of such a predicate.
If a callback is provided, then constraint-violating alerts won’t be printed and \textit{CallbackPredicate} is called instead. If a violation is detected, that first argument will be bound to the list of violating instances of the constraint, so the callback could take a corrective action. For instance, for our conflict-of-interests constraint, we could define the following corrective action:

\begin{verbatim}
resolve_COI(\textit{Violators},\textit{File},\textit{Line}) :-
deleteall{\textit{Y} | COI(\textit{Empl},\textit{Comp}) \in \textit{Violators}, \textit{Y}=consults(\textit{Empl},\textit{Comp})},
(   write('Violation of constraint in file '), write(\textit{File}),
   write(' on line '), write(\textit{Line}), write(' was detected: '),
   writeln(\textit{Violators}).
   write('Corrective action was deletion of '),
   write(consults(\textit{Person},\textit{Company})),
   writeln(' for all violated instances of the constraint')
)@\io.
\end{verbatim}

which deletes the facts that cause the violation and then prints a message about what was done to correct the violation. (In databases, this is called a “compensating” transaction.) To tell \texttt{ERGO} that this corrective action is to be taken, the constraint must be activated using the 2-argument version of \texttt{+constraint{...}} instead of the 1-argument version used before:

\begin{verbatim}
?- +constraint{COI(?1,?), resolve_COI(?1,\@F,\@L}.
\end{verbatim}

We see that the first argument (the variable \texttt{?}) is left unbound because it will be bound by the system to the list of violating instances of the constraint; arguments 2 and 3 are instantiated with the quazi-constants \texttt{\@F} and \texttt{\@L}. To remind (from Section 7.6), the first quazi-constant is replaced by the compiler with the name of the file in which the above \texttt{+constraint{...}} statement appears and \texttt{\@L} is replaced with the appropriate line number. This is how the callback in our example gets its file and line arguments.

Finally, in the \texttt{–constraint{...}} statement, the second argument is checked for syntax, but is ignored. Therefore, it makes little sense to provide a second argument here—regardless of whether the constraint being deleted does or does not use a callback.

\textbf{Performance considerations.} One should keep in mind that an active constraint injects a query (to find all violating instances) after each top-level query, which cannot but affect the performance. Therefore, one should strive to keep the number of active constraints to a minimum and to design the constraints to be lightweight. It would be an understatement to say that, if a constraint check goes into an infinite loop, the resulting problem would be very hard to figure out.
39 Alerts

An alert statement is a request to monitor a predicate or a frame (including isa- and subclass-literals) for certain predefined conditions. Note: the monitored predicate cannot be a complex subgoal, nor can it be a conjunction or disjunction, not even a \naf of something. It can be a \neg of a predicate or a frame, however. If the status of a predicate (or frame) monitored by an alert changes as a result of an update transaction, the alert is raised. At present, ERGO supports these types of alerts:

- conflict alerts
- truth alerts

A conflict alert is raised if a monitored predicate or frame has a conflict after a transaction and that conflict did not exist before the transaction.

For a true literal, foo, defined via non-defeasible rules (see Section 40), this means that \neg foo can also be derived and therefore the information about foo is contradictory. If foo is defeasible, a conflict means that there is an opposing literal bar (i.e., \opposes(foo,bar) is true) and both foo and bar are derivable if defeasibility is disregarded. Note that both foo and bar could be false due to being defeated and yet they maybe in conflict (and this is likely the reason why they were defeated).

Truth alerts are simpler. A truth alert for a literal foo is raised after a transaction if foo was false before the transaction and became true after.

Conflict alerts. To illustrate the concept of a conflict, suppose employee(Acme,John,2016) means that John works for Acme and \neg employee(Acme,Bob,2017) means that Bob was fired by Acme. If neither employee(foo,bar) nor \neg employee(foo,bar) is true, it means that foo neither hired nor fired bar. The management might want to be alerted if the same employee was hired and fired in the same year. Note that this is not a constraint, as hiring and firing of the same employee in the same year is not an integrity violation.

To tell ERGO that we would like to be notified about the aforesaid events, we can use the alert primitive:

?- +alert{conflict,employee(?,?,?)}.  

Then, if employee(Acme,John,2016) already exists and we execute the transaction insert{\neg employee(Acme,John,2016)} then this alert will be raised:
?- insert{\neg employee(Acme,John,2016)}.

*** Conflict alerts raised after transaction insert{\neg employee(Acme,John,2016)}: 
est employee(Acme,John,2016)
These alerts were activated on line 3 in file mykb.ergo

Alerts with callbacks.  Similarly to constraints, one can tell ERGO to call a HiLog predicate when an alert is raised. Again as in the case of a constraint, the callback predicate must be at least one argument, and that argument must be unbound. It will be bound by the system to the list of alerts discovered during the transaction. For instance, we could define

employee_alert_callback(?Alerts,?Module) :-
  insert{employee_alerts(?Alerts)},
  fmt_write('Employee alerts in module %s
', arg(?Module))@\io,
  fmt_write('The alerts %S are logged.
', arg(?Alerts))@\io.

Then we could activate the alert using the 3-argument version of the +alert{...} primitive:

?- +alert{conflict,employee(?,?,?), employee_alert_callback(?,@)}.

Recall that \@ above is a quasi-constant denoting the current module.

Complex alerts.  Lest the reader thinks that only simple alerts can be specified using the above mechanism, here is a much more involved example. Suppose we want to be notified if an employee was fired not only in the same year, but within less that 4 years. To do so, we cannot simply use the employee predicate as before, but we can define what we need via rules:

\[ \text{longtime_or_current_employee}(\text{?Company},\text{?Empl}) \leftarrow \text{employee}(\text{?Company},\text{?Empl},?). \]
\[ \text{\neg longtime_or_current_employee}(\text{?Company},\text{?Empl}) \leftarrow \text{employee}(\text{?Company},\text{?Empl},\text{?Year}), \]
\[ \text{\neg employee}(\text{?Company},\text{?Empl},\text{?Year2}), \]
\[ ?\text{Year2} >= ?\text{Year}, \]
\[ ?\text{Year2} - ?\text{Year} < 4. \]

?- +alert{conflict,longtime_or_current_employee(?,:)}.  

Now, a conflict alert will be raised whenever an employee is fired within 4 years from hiring. With a little bit of thinking, arbitrarily complex alerts can be specified with the help of rules using the above idea.
**Truth alerts.** Truth alerts are defined similarly to conflict alerts except that *truth* is used as the first argument instead of *conflict*:

```
+alert{truth,longtime_or_current_employee(?Company,?Empl)}.
```

If some instances of `longtime_or_current_employee(?Company,?Empl)` become true as a result of a transaction, a warning similar to conflict updates will appear. For instance,

```prolog
*** Truth alerts raised after transaction insert{\neg employee(Acme,John,2016)}:
    longtime_or_current_employee(Acme,John)
    longtime_or_current_employee(GroupLTD,Bob)
These alerts were activated on line 3 in file mykb.ergo
```

Callbacks and deactivation of truth alerts are specified analogously to conflict alerts.

Note that alerts of type `truth` have many similarities with integrity constraints described in Section 38. Indeed, instead of

```
?- +constraint{COI(?Company,?Person)}.
```

in the examples in that section we could as well request

```
?- +alert{truth,COI(?Company,?Person)}.
```

and the results would be similar. Indeed, in both cases, true instances of the query `COI(?Company,?Person)` would be reported after each transaction. There are, however, several significant differences:

- An alert is *not* conceptualized as an integrity constraint, so transactional updates will *not* be rolled back, if the monitored predicate becomes true.
- An alert is raised only for the instances of the monitored predicate that became true as a result of the preceding transaction. Instances that were true before the transaction are not reported. In contrast, constraint violations are always reported—new and old—after each update transaction.
- Alerts are more expensive computationally than constraints because they monitor the state of the knowledge base before and after each transaction. A constraint checks only the after-states.

Finally, we would like to remind something that important even if obvious: each alert results in a query (to find prior conflicts or truths) prior to evaluation of *any* top-level query. It also results in an execution of another query right after the previous top-level query, if the latter was a state-changing transaction. Therefore, one should keep the number of active alerts to absolute necessity and one should strive to keep the monitored predicates rather lightweight.
40 Defeasible Reasoning

Defeasible reasoning is a form of non-monotonic logical reasoning where some rule instances can be defeated by other rule instances. The defeated rules do not need to be satisfied by the intended model of the knowledge base. ERGO supports the form of defeasible reasoning known as Logic Programs with Defaults and Argumentation Theories, as described in [15].

The basic mechanisms by which the user can control defeasible reasoning include the notions of rule overriding and literal opposition. We will not describe the semantics of defeasible reasoning formally, but instead will give an informal overview.

The basic idea is that the user specifies overriding and opposition using the appropriate predicates and then the associated argumentation theory decides which ground instances of which rules are defeated (and thus do not need to be satisfied by the intended model).

To this end, any rule can be tagged by adding a primitive \texttt{@tagname} to the left of the rule. Tags do not have to be unique and should not be confused with rule Ids. However, if no rule tag is explicitly given, the Id of the rule is used.

To see how it all works, consider a few examples. The first is a classical example that states that all birds generally fly, but some do not:

\begin{verbatim}
:- use_argumentation_theory. // tell the system that rules can be defeasible
@{default} \exists X:Flies :- \exists X:Bird.       // all birds fly (by default)
@{penguin} \neg \exists X:Flies :- \exists X:Penguin. // but penguins don’t
@{wounded} \neg \exists X:Flies :- \exists X:Wounded. // and neither do wounded things
Penguin::Bird.       // penguins are birds
Sam:Penguin.         // Sam is a penguin
Fred:Bird.           // Fred is a bird
Bob:{Bird,Wounded}.  // Bob is a wounded bird
\overrides({wounded,penguin},default). // being wounded or penguin
                      // trumps the default rule
\end{verbatim}

Here the first three rules have tags, which makes them defeasible. That is, whatever they might derive may still be invalidated. How? For instance, all birds fly by penguins do not. Sam is a penguin and thus a bird. According to the default rule, he should be able to fly, but according to the penguin rule he should not—a contradiction. The situation with Bob is similar: as a bird, he should be able to fly, but not as a wounded being. The way out is given by the last \texttt{\overrides} statement, which says that if a default rule’s conclusion conflicts with a conclusion made via the penguin or a wounded rule, the latter take precedence. In other words, no contradiction occurs and both \texttt{\neg Sam:Flies} and \texttt{\neg Bob:Flies} are true (but not \texttt{Sam:Flies} or \texttt{Bob:Flies}). On the other hand, no conflict exists with respect to Fred and \texttt{Fred:Flies} is derived. What would
have happened if the above conflicts were not resolved by the \texttt{overrides} statement? In that case, both \texttt{Sam:Flies} and \texttt{\neg Sam:Flies} would be false, and similarly for \texttt{Bob}.

In the previous example, we do not have the \texttt{opposes} statement, which was mentioned earlier. This is because the conflicting nature of any statement, like \texttt{Sam:Flies} and its \texttt{\neg}-negation is obvious. In some cases, however, such a conflict cannot be assumed a priori, and this where the \texttt{opposes} statement helps. Consider a pricing database where the prices of items depend on the supplier:

```prolog
:- use_argumentation_theory.
@{food} bread[price(store1) -> 2].
@{food} bread[price(store2) -> 3].
@{food} milk[price(store3) -> 2].
@{food} milk[price(store4) -> 2].
@{food} carrots[price(store2) -> 1].
@{food} carrots[price(store3) -> 1.5].
```

There is nothing strange in prices being different in different stores, but in some countries certain staple foods, such as bread, are regulated and must have the same price. There are many ways to deal with this problem. One would be to abort insert operations if they violate the same-price constraint. However, this is not always possible or desirable (e.g., when information is integrated from different sources). Defeasibility provides a different solution, which allows \texttt{E\textsuperscript{RGO}} to \texttt{tolerate} contradictions. What we can do is to say that it is a contradiction for a regulated item to have two prices:

```prolog
\texttt{opposes(?Itm[price(?)->?P1],?Itm[price(?)->?P2]) :-}
\texttt{regulated(?Itm),}
\texttt{?P1 != ?P2.}
\texttt{regulated({bread,milk})}.  
```

In the previous example, we provided a way to resolve a contradiction, but here we did not. As a result, the facts \texttt{bread[price(store1) -> 2]} and \texttt{bread[price(store2) -> 3]} will be false (i.e., the conflicting information will be zapped) while the price of milk will not be zapped, since there is no variation in prices in different stores. For carrots, the price varies, but it is not a regulated product, so no contradiction arises.

### 40.1 Concepts of Defeasible Reasoning

The previous section illustrated the concepts of overriding and opposition used in defeasible reasoning. We will look at these and other related concepts in more detail here.
A rule instance \( \rho_1 \), tagged \( i_1 \), opposes another rule instance, \( \rho_2 \) tagged \( i_2 \), if and only if \( \text{opposes}(i_1, \text{head}(\rho_1), i_2, \text{head}(\rho_2)) \) is true, where \( \text{head}(\rho_i) \) denotes the head-literal of the corresponding rule. Literals for the form \( \text{lit} \) and \( \neg \text{lit} \) always oppose each other so this fact does not need to be explicitly specified using \text{opposes}. A rule instance \( \rho_1 \), tagged \( i_1 \), overrides another rule instance \( \rho_2 \), tagged \( i_2 \), if and only if \( \text{overrides}(i_1, \text{head}(\rho_1), i_2, \text{head}(\rho_2)) \) is true. (For convenience, \( \mathcal{ERGO} \) also defines 2-argument versions of these predicates, but this is unimportant for the present discussion.) We say that two rule instances are in conflict if they oppose each other and their bodies are true in the intended model of the knowledge base. A more detailed description of rule conflict and overriding appears in Section 40.3.

A rule can be defeated in several different ways. It can be

- refuted
- rebutted
- disqualified.

Different argumentation theories may assign different meanings to these concepts, but roughly they mean the following. A rule instance \( \rho_1 \), tagged \( i_1 \), refutes another rule instance \( \rho_2 \), tagged \( i_2 \), if and only if these rules are in conflict and the former rule instance overrides the latter. The rule instance \( \rho_1 \), tagged \( i_1 \), rebuts the rule \( \rho_2 \) with tag \( i_2 \) if and only if the two instances are in conflict and neither instance is refuted by some other rule instance.

Rule disqualification is not so commonly agreed upon a notion as the other two. A rule is disqualified, if it is canceled, i.e., if it matches a cancellation literal that is true and not defeated. More details on cancellation appear in Section 40.4. More details on cancellation appear in Section 40.4. In addition, some argumentation theories disqualify rules in other cases as well. The default argumentation theory in \( \mathcal{ERGO} \) postulates that a rule instance \( \rho_1 \), tagged \( i_1 \), is disqualified if

- If it transitively defeats itself, i.e., there is a sequence of tagged rule instances \((i_1, \rho_1), (i_2, \rho_2), \ldots, (i_{n-1}, \rho_{n-1}), (i_n, \rho_n)\), such that \( i_n = i_1 \), \( \rho_n = \rho_1 \), and at each step \((i_i, \rho_i)\) either refutes or rebuts \((i_{i+1}, \rho_{i+1})\).

These notions are very useful for debugging the knowledge base (finding out why certain inferences were or were not made), and we will discuss the corresponding debugging primitives in Section 40.8.

It is important to keep in mind that both \text{overrides} and \text{opposes} are user-level predicates, which are defined by the user as a set of facts (most commonly) and (less commonly) rules. The system uses these predicates to determine which rules are defeated but the user normally does not
query these predicates explicitly except for debugging. These predicates are typically queried by the system to get answers to questions like “is there a rule that overrides (or opposes to) a given rule?” (e.g., `overrides(?X,r123)`) or “check that this rule is not overwritten (or is opposed to) by some other rule” (e.g., `naf overrides(?X,r345)`). In other words, `overrides` and `opposes` are likely to be called with some of the arguments unbound. Because of that, one must be careful with what is in the body of the rules that define these predicates. For instance, in the following rule for `overrides`, one parametrized rule-tag (as we shall see, rule tags can be terms with variables) is said to override another based on the values of the parameters, which are assumed to be numbers:

```
overrides(rule1(?h),rule2(?j)) :- ?h >?j.
```

The problem here is that `>` is a mode-sensitive predicate, which expects both of its arguments to be bound to an integer. However, as discussed above, `overrides` might be called with one of the arguments, say the first, unbound. In this case, `?h` will be unbound at the time `?h >?j` is called and a runtime error will ensue.

### 40.2 Specifying an Argumentation Theory to Use

ERGO supports a generalized form of defeasible reasoning. The user can enable defeasible reasoning on a per-module basis, and different theories of defeasibility can be used in different modules. The type of defeasible reasoning to be used depends on the chosen *argumentation theory*, which defines the *arguments* (as in “arguing”) that the reasoner has to use in order to decide what inferences are to be defeated. Syntactically, defeasible reasoning is requested by placing one of the following directives at the top of the appropriate module (before any rules are given):

```
:- use_argumentation_theory.
:- use_argumentation_theory{Module}.
```

The first instruction directs ERGO to use the default argumentation theory module, `\gcl`, which stands for Generalized Courteous Logic (or GCL). One can use a different theory of defeasible reasoning by implementing an appropriate argumentation theory and loading its file into some module `foo`. A file that actually uses this argumentation theory should have the directive

```
:- use_argumentation_theory{foo}.
```

at the top. Thus, different modules of the same ERGO knowledge base can use different theories of defeasible reasoning. For instance, if some argumentation theory is implemented in file `myargth.ergo`, then it can be declared in a ERGO module using
De defeasible reasoning

:- use_argumentation_theory{foo}.
?- [myargth>>foo].

Defeasible theories must use certain API, which will be described in a later version of this manual. Meanwhile, one can construct such theories by analogy with GCL—see AT/flrgclp.ergo.

Note that argumentation theories affect only defeasible rules and the defeasibility status of a rule can be changed from strict to defeasible and vice versa—see Section 36.

40.3 Rule Overriding and Conflicts

Rule overriding can be specified via one of the following two forms:

\texttt{\textbackslash overrides(RuleLab1,RuleLab2).}
\texttt{\textbackslash overrides(RuleLab1,AtomForm1,RuleLab2,AtomForm2).}

The first form of the \texttt{\textbackslash overrides} statement says that the rule with tag RuleLab1 overrides the rule with the rule tag RuleLab2 regardless of what the heads of those rules are. The second form of \texttt{\textbackslash overrides} says the following. Let \( \rho_1 \) be a rule with the tag RuleLab1 and head \( H_1 \), and \( \rho_2 \) be a rule with the tag RuleLab2 and head \( H_2 \). Assume that the variables in \( \rho_1, \rho_2 \), and the \texttt{\textbackslash overrides} rule are standardized apart (i.e., are not shared, which can be always achieved by renaming). Then for any substitution \( \theta \) such that \( \theta(H_1) = \theta(AtomForm1) = \theta(H_2) = \theta(AtomForm2) \), the rule-instance \( \theta(\rho_1) \) overrides the rule-instance \( \theta(\rho_2) \).

The \texttt{\textbackslash opposes} predicate specifies which literals in the rule heads should be considered to be in conflict, if derived simultaneously. As with the \texttt{\textbackslash overrides} predicate, \texttt{\textbackslash opposes} has two forms:

\texttt{\textbackslash opposes(AtomForm1,AtomForm2).}
\texttt{\textbackslash opposes(RuleLab1,AtomForm1,RuleLab2,AtomForm2).}

The first form of the \texttt{\textbackslash opposes} predicate says that the base formulas \( AtomForm1 \) and \( AtomForm2 \) contradict each other. More precisely, for any variable substitution \( \theta \), the knowledge base must not infer \( \theta(AtomForm1) \) if \( \theta(AtomForm2) \) is also inferred, and vice versa. The 4-argument version of \texttt{\textbackslash opposes} is more restrictive: it says that, for any substitution \( \theta \), the knowledge base must not infer \( \theta(AtomForm1) \) by means of a rule with tag RuleLab1, if \( \theta(AtomForm2) \) is inferred by means of a rule with tag RuleLab2, and vice versa. Note that by “inference” here we mean inference with respect to the argumentation theory in use—not just with respect to the usual first-order logic. For instance, \( a \ :- \ b \) and \( b \) do not necessarily imply \( a \) because the rule \( a \ :- \ b \) may be defeated by a different rule.

Both \texttt{\textbackslash opposes} and \texttt{\textbackslash overrides} can be defined via user rules as well as facts, and these rules and facts can even be added and deleted or disabled/enabled at run-time using the statements
insert{...}/delete{...}, insertrule{...}/deleterule{...}, enable{...}/disable{...}. However, excessive use of these facilities is not recommended because the knowledge base might get hairy and hard to understand. This is especially true in the case of the \texttt{opposes} predicate. Although it is advised to be conservative with these predicates lest the meaning of a knowledge base becomes obscure, there are no syntactic restrictions on the use of \texttt{overrides} and \texttt{opposes}: they can appear in rule bodies, heads, in aggregate functions, and so on.

It should be kept in mind that for any non-transactional literal \texttt{L} (base HiLog formula, frame, ISA, or subclass), \texttt{L} and \texttt{\neg L} always oppose each other, and there is no need to state this explicitly: it is part of the underlying theory of defeasible reasoning. Transactional literals do not participate in defeasible reasoning. They cannot be negated using \texttt{\neg}, but the compiler does not check if they appear as arguments to \texttt{opposes}. If they do, this information is ignored.

40.4 Cancellation of Rules

Sometimes it is useful to turn off—or cancel—a rule instance, if certain conditions are satisfied. This can be specified using the special predicate \texttt{cancel}. The default argumentation theory in \texttt{ERGO} understands two versions of that predicate:

\[
\texttt{cancel}(tag).
\]
\[
\texttt{cancel}(tag, head).
\]

The first rule cancels all rule instances whose tag unifies with \texttt{tag} and the second version cancels only those rules whose tag unifies with \texttt{tag} and whose head unifies with \texttt{head}.

Cancellation rules can also be tagged, overridden, or canceled by other cancellation rules. To illustrate, consider the following example:

\texttt{t(aa)}.
\texttt{t(bb)}.
\texttt{@(L1) tt1(?X) :- t(?X)}.
\texttt{@(L2) tt2(?X) :- t(?X)}.
\texttt{@(L3) tt3(?X) :- t(?X)}.
\texttt{@(c1) \texttt{cancel} (?,tt1(bb)).}
\texttt{@(c2) \texttt{cancel}(L2).
\texttt{@(c3) \texttt{cancel} (?,tt3(aa)).}
\texttt{@(c4) \texttt{cancel} (?,tt3(bb)).}
\texttt{@(c5) \texttt{cancel}(c4).}

Here \texttt{tt1} is true only of \texttt{aa} and \texttt{tt3} only of \texttt{bb}. \texttt{tt2} is false for both \texttt{aa} and \texttt{bb}. For instance,
\(tt1(bb)\) is false because of the cancellation rule \(c1\). Similarly, \(tt3(a)\) is false because it is canceled by the rule \(c3\). More interesting, however, is the reason for \(tt3(bb)\) being true. Note that rule tagged with \(c4\) cancels the derivation of \(tt3(bb)\). However, rule \(c5\) cancels rule \(c4\), so \(tt3(bb)\) stays put.

Observe the use of the 1-argument and 2-argument cancellation predicate. The first argument is always a term that matches rule tags for the rules to be canceled. The second argument, if present, matches the heads of the rules to be canceled. For instance, \(\cancel(L2)\) cancels only the rule tagged \(L2\). If more than one rule matches \(L2\) (this is possible, but is not the case in our example), then all such rules are canceled. Two-argument cancellation predicates cancel only the rules that match both arguments. In our case, however, the first argument is a variable, as in \(\cancel(?,tt3(aa))\), which means that all the rules matching the head are canceled, regardless of the tag.\(^{17}\)

Here is a more complicated example:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{device} & (\text{printer}). & \text{abused} & (\text{Bob},\text{printer}). & \text{pardon} & (\text{printer},\text{Bob}). \\
\text{device} & (\text{scanner}). & \text{abused} & (\text{Bob},\text{scanner}). & \text{pardon} & (\text{scanner},\text{Bill}). \\
\text{device} & (\text{fax}). & \text{abused} & (\text{Bill},\text{scanner}). & \text{abused} & (\text{Bill},\text{printer}). \\
& & & \text{abused} & (\text{Bill},\text{printer}). & \text{abused} & (\text{Mary},\text{fax}). \\
\text{person} & (\text{Bob}), \text{person} & (\text{Bill}), \text{person} & (\text{Mary}). \\
\@id1 & \text{authorized} & (\text{?Persn},\text{?Device}) & :- & \text{device} & (\text{?Device}), \text{person} (\text{?Persn}). \\
\@id2 & \text{authorized} & (\text{?Persn},\text{?Dev}) & :- & \text{abused} & (\text{?Persn},\text{?Dev}). \\
\@id3 & \text{authorized} & (\text{?Persn},\text{?Dev}) & :- & \text{pardon} & (\text{?Persn},\text{?Persn}).
\end{align*}
\]

The most interesting feature here is the tag \(id2\) parametrized with variables and the rule tagged \(id3\), which uses that parametrized tag in the head. Note also that here the cancellation rules are conditional. The effect is that rule \(id3\) cancels the instances of the cancellation rule tagged \(id2(\text{printer},\text{Bob})\) and \(id2(\text{scanner},\text{Bill})\), which has the effect of authorizing Bob to use the printer and Bill to use the scanner, despite the reported abuses. The reader can verify that the net effect of all the cancellations and counter-cancellations is that Bill and Bob can use the fax, Bob and Mary are authorized to use the printer, and Bill and Mary can use the scanner.

Another interesting situation arises when cancellation rules are defeated not due to overriding, but due to a conflict with some other cancellation rule. For instance,

\[
\begin{align*}
\@r & \text{P}. \\
\@c1 & \cancel(r). \\
\@c2 & \text{neg} \cancel(r).
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{17}\) Again, in our case, only one rule head matches the literal \(tt3(a)\), but in general there can be several.
Here rule \( c_1 \) cancels rule \( r \), but \( c_1 \) conflicts with \( c_2 \), since the two rules contradict each other. As a result, \( P \) stays true.

Finally, we should note that, if a rule that is being canceled overrides the canceling rule, than the first-mentioned rule stands and the cancellation rule is defeated instead. For example, in

\[
\begin{align*}
@\{L1\} & \text{foo(1).} \\
@\{L2\} & \text{foo(2).} \\
@\{L3\} & \cancel(?,\text{foo(?)}). \\
\text{overrides(L1,foo(1),?,\cancel(L1,foo(1))).}
\end{align*}
\]

the instance \( \cancel(L1,\text{foo(1)}) \) is defeated and \( \text{foo(1)} \) remains true. However, \( \text{foo(2)} \) gets canceled.

One might think that it makes little sense to specify the rule being canceled as having higher priority than the canceling rule and that it is simply a case of ill-design. However, there can be good reasons to design rules in this way. Suppose the following information is given at two different sites:

**Site 1:**
\[
\begin{align*}
@\{L11\} & \text{foo(1).} \\
@\{L12\} & \text{bar.}
\end{align*}
\]

**Site 2:**
\[
\begin{align*}
@\{L21\} & \cancel(?,\text{foo(?)}). \\
@\{L22\} & \text{foo(2).}
\end{align*}
\]

Site 1 might want to merge the rules from Site 2, but it is unwilling to let the \( \cancel(?,\text{foo(?)}) \) statement tagged \( L21 \) to have effect on the rules of Site 1. That is, for the merged set of rules, it is ok to let the \( L22 \) statement to be canceled (because it was supposed to be canceled at Site 2), but it is not ok for the newly merged rules to cancel \( L21 \). To achieve this effect, we can add the following statements to the above:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{origin}(L11,\text{site1}). \\
\text{origin}(L12,\text{site1}). \\
\text{origin}(L21,\text{site2}). \\
\text{origin}(L22,\text{site2}). \\
\text{overrides}(?lab1,?, ?lab2,?) :- \text{origin}(?lab1,\text{site1}), \text{origin}(?lab2,\text{site2}).
\end{align*}
\]

The first four facts simply tell us where each rule came from. The last rule says that the rules that came from \text{site1} take precedence over the rules that came from \text{site2}. Note that we are in
the same situation as described earlier: the fact L21 cancels both L11 and L22, but L11 has higher priority. As a result, L22 remains canceled and is false, but L11 is not canceled and remains true.

### 40.5 Changing the Default Defeasibility Status

In Section 36, we discussed the default defeasibility policy and the fact that defeasibility can be changed using the `makestrict/makedefeasible` primitives. This policy says that rules that have no explicit tags and no explicit defeasibility descriptor `@@{defeasible}` are considered strict. To change this default policy, ERGO provides two compiler directives:

```
:- default_is_defeasible_rules.
:- default_is_defeasible.   // short form
:- default_is_strict_rules.
:- default_is_strict.      // short form
```

The `default_is_defeasible_rules` directive changes the default so that untagged rules become defeasible. The directive `default_is_strict_rules` changes the default back to strict. These directives can appear any number of times in the file, changing the treatment of the untagged rules to the desired default. (Of course, such frequent switching is not advisable.)

Sometimes it is useful to be able to query the rule base based on rule tags and heads. Such queries can be issued using the `clause{...}` primitive. However, if you do not need to query the rule bodies, a faster way is to use the `tag` primitive. For instance, if we have the rules

```
:- use_argumentation_theory.
abc(?X) :- cde(?X).
@{p} foo :- bar.
@@{defeasible} abc2(?X) :- cde2(?X).
@@{strict} foo2 :- bar2.
```

then the query

```
?- tag{?X,?Y@main}.
```

will return the following answers:

```
?X = 2
?Y = ${abc(?_h8660)@main}
?X = 4
```
?Y = ${abc2(?_h8623)@main}

?X = 5

?Y = ${foo2@main}

?X = p

?Y = ${foo@main}

Note that the query \texttt{tag(?X,?Y)} (without the module specification for the head, will likely return many answers, as there can be many rules in different loaded modules.

### 40.6 Supported Argumentation Theories

At present, ERGO supports several different argumentation theories: the cautious, the original, and the strong courteous logics plus also a logic with general exclusion constraints. The ERGO library of argumentation theories also contains a number of experimental packages that are not described here.

#### 40.6.1 The Cautious, Original, and Strong Courteous Argumentation Theories

These argumentation theories are very similar to each other; the differences lie on the edges. All these theories use the \texttt{\textbf{opposes}} and \texttt{\textbf{overrides}} predicates as well as the notions of rebuttal, refutation, and cancellation as the means for determining which rule instances are to be defeated. The difference is that, in the original courteous theory, a rule, \( R \), is defeated if another rule defeats, rebuts, or cancels \( R \). In the cautious theory, that other (defeating) rule must not itself be defeated in order to defeat \( R \). The cautious theory does not also let that other rule be involved in a circular defeating relationships, i.e., there can be no sequence of tagged rule instances \((i_1, \rho_1), (i_2, \rho_2), \ldots, (i_{n-1}, \rho_{n-1}), (i_n, \rho_n)\), such that \( i_n = i_1 \), \( \rho_n = \rho_1 \), and at each step \((i_i, \rho_i)\) either refutes or rebuts \((i_{i+1}, \rho_{i+1})\).

The strong Courteous argumentation theory is in-between the cautious and the original Courteous theories. It is very similar to the original theory except that it does not allow the defeating rule, \( \rho_1 \), to be rebutted or refuted by the rule \( \rho_2 \) that is being defeated by \( \rho_1 \).

The cautious argumentation theory is the default and should be good for most applications. It can be invoked by placing

\begin{verbatim}
:- use_argumentation_theory.
\end{verbatim}

at the top of a ERGO module where defeasible reasoning is to be used. This loads the new courteous
argumentation theory into the builtin module \texttt{gcl}. For the original courteous argumentation theory, place the following at the top:

\begin{verbatim}
:- use_argumentation_theory{ogcl}.
?- [ogclp>>ogcl].
\end{verbatim}

The original argumentation theory is then available in the module \texttt{ogcl} (which stands for “original gcl;” of course, the user can choose a different module name).

The strong argumentation theory can be requested as follows (where, again, the choice of the module is up to the user):

\begin{verbatim}
:- use_argumentation_theory{sgcl}.
?- [sgclp>>sgcl].
\end{verbatim}

### 40.6.2 Courteous Logic with Exclusion Constraints

This argumentation theory allows a group of facts larger than two to oppose to each other. This does not mean that the facts in that group are pairwise exclusive. Instead, it means that the facts in the group cannot be true together (but subsets of these facts can be true).

The argumentation theory with exclusion constraints can be invoked by placing the following at the top of an appropriate module:

\begin{verbatim}
:- use_argumentation_theory{gcle}.
?- [gclpe>>gcle].
\end{verbatim}

Again, the user can choose to load this argumentation theory into a differently named module.

The main difference between this argumentation theory and the two previous ones is that it allows more than two rule heads to oppose each other. The syntax is

\begin{verbatim}
id:\texttt{Exclusion[\{opposers->\{opposer1, ..., opposerN}\]}].
\end{verbatim}

This kind of statements is called an \textit{exclusion constraint} and it means that \texttt{opposer1, ..., opposerN} cannot be all true at the same time. The opposers \texttt{opposer1, ..., opposerN} must be all reified. The term \texttt{id} is the identifier of the exclusion constraint. The usual \texttt{\opposes} statements are also understood; they are treated as binary exclusion constraints. As with \texttt{\opposes}, the above exclusion constraints can have variables and they can also be defined by rules.

In case all opposers in an inclusion constraint are true, overriding determines which of them are defeated. Intuitively, the defeated opposers are those that do not “beat” (rebut) any other opposer in the same exclusion constraint.
40.7 Defeasible Rules Must Be Purely Logical

It must be kept in mind that all rules involved in defeasible reasoning must be purely logical. This includes both the tagged rules of the core knowledge base (whether they are explicitly mentioned in the overrides/opposes statements or not) as well as the rules that define the predicates \texttt{overrides} and \texttt{opposes}. If such a rule depends on a strict rule then the latter must also be purely logical. “Purely logical” here means that the bodies of such rules cannot use non-logical or dynamic features, such as:

- I/O statements
- Insert/delete statements
- The cut (!), the predicates \texttt{ground/1}, \texttt{var/1}, \texttt{nonvar/1}, and similar. These predicates can be used only if the alternatives (when the predicates fail) cause an abort and issue an error message for the user. For instance, the following predicate

\begin{verbatim}
%check_state(?s) :- ground(?s), !.
%check_state(?s) :- abort(['Nonground state found: ', ?s, ' . Might cause infinite recursion.'])@\sys.
\end{verbatim}

\texttt{%check_state(?s)} can be used in the body of a defeasible rule (or of the rules defining \texttt{overrides} and \texttt{opposes}) because the alternative to being ground here aborts the inference process. This is because \texttt{ground/1} is a logically clean predicate: if its argument is not ground, the predicate \texttt{%check_state(?s)} aborts.

- \textit{Modal} predicates that require bound arguments, which include:
  - Comparison operators $>$, $<$, etc., unless it is assured that both sides of the comparison are ground during the inference.
  - Inequality operators, such as $!=$, $!==$, $\neq$, $\neq$, unless it is certain that both arguments get bound during the evaluation.
  - The evaluation operator \texttt{left \is right}, unless \texttt{right} is bound to an appropriate evaluable expression.

In all these cases, a general remedy in case of a runtime error that complains about unbound arguments is to identify the appropriate domain for the variables that must be bound and bind the variables in question before the modal predicate is invoked. For instance, suppose we wish to say that argument 2 of the predicate \texttt{price} must not have two different values for the same item (in argument 1):

\begin{verbatim}
\texttt{opposes(price(?x,?p1),price(?x,?p2)) :- ?p1 \neq ?p2}.
\end{verbatim}
Unfortunately, such a definition will almost certainly cause a runtime error because one of the ?p1 or ?p2 will end up unbound in the course of the reasoning performed inside the argumentation theory. However, we do know that these variables must be bound to prices and thus we could write

\[\text{opposes(price(?x,?p1),price(?x,?p2)) :-}
\begin{align*}
\text{price(?x,?p1),} \\
\text{price(?x,?p2),} \\
\text{?p1 \neq ?p2.}
\end{align*}\]

This will likely bind ?p1 and ?p2 before the inequality \( \neq \) is used.\(^{18}\) On the other hand,

\[\text{opposes(price(?x,?p1),price(?x,?p2)) :- ?p1 \neq ?p2.}\]

is likely to work fine because \( \neq \) is delayed until both arguments become bound. Generally, \( \neq \) and \( \\neq \) are slower than but safer and more declarative than \( \equiv \) and \( \equiv \) because their evaluation is delayed when necessary and they are not that dependent on their position in the rule body. The comparison operators \(<, >\), etc., as well as the \( \equiv \) operator are also generally safe, if their arguments get bound eventually.

### 40.8 Debugging Defeasible Knowledge Bases

To help the user debug defeasible knowledge base, argumentation theories provide a special API, which can be used to find out why certain inferences were or were not made. The API consists of several methods, which take status-objects of the form \text{status(ruleTag,ruleHead)} and returns information such as why a certain rule was defeated, which rules are defeated by the given one, etc. The list of methods follows:

- \text{status(?T,?H) [howDefeated -> ?Reason].}

  Here ?T is a rule Id and ?H is a rule head. The rule head cannot be a variable. There is no need to reify the rule head: \text{ERGO} understands that a rule-head literal is expected and will compile it accordingly.

  If the corresponding rule is not defeated, the query fails. Otherwise, ?Reason is the result of the query. It can take three different forms:

\(^{18}\) We say “likely” because \text{price(?x,?p)} itself may be defined by rules (rather than by a collection of facts) and these rules might involve comparisons, arithmetic operations, etc., and thus may require that it be called with some arguments (e.g., ?x) bound. However, it cannot be guaranteed that, in the above rule, \text{price(?x,...)} will always be called with ?x bound.
defeatedBy(ruleTag,ruleHead): In this case, all rule tag/head pairs that refute the rule(s) represented by the \(?T/?H\) pair (i.e., whose tag unifies with \(?T\) and head with \(?H\)) will be returned.

rebutedBy(ruleTag,ruleHead): All the rule tag/head pairs that rebut the rule(s) represented by the \(?T/?H\) pair will be returned.

disqualified: This is returned if the rule is disqualified. In the default \(\text{gcl}\) theory, a rule is disqualified if it is canceled, overridden by a strict rule, or if it transitively refutes/rebuts itself. In this case, an auxiliary method, howDisqualified, can provide additional information, as described next.

canceled: Other argumentation theories disqualify a rule only if it is canceled. These theories return canceled in this case instead of disqualified.

beatenByStrictRule(?ruleHead): This means that a strict rule with the head \(?ruleHead\) opposes the rule with tag \(?T\) and head \(?H\).

status(?T,?H)[howDisqualified->defeatCycle(?Defeater,?Defeated)].
If the rules represented by the \(?T/?H\) pair are disqualified (in the default argumentation theory), this method returns the set of terms of the form defeats(?Defeater,?Defeated). Here both \(?Defeater\) and \(?Defeated\) are tag/head pairs that are defeated by the \(?T/?H\) pair and, in addition, \(?Defeater\) defeats \(?Defeated\). By following these pairs one should be able to discover a cycle of defeats starting and ending with \(?T/?H\), which constitutes a self-defeating cycle.

status(?T,?H)[howDisqualified->canceled].
This query is true if all the rules whose tag unifies with \(?T\) and head with \(?H\) are canceled.

status(?T,?H)[howDisqualified->beatenByStrictRule(?SRH)].
This literal is true if all the defeasible rules with tag \(?T\) and head \(?H\) have an opposing strict rule. In that case, \(?SRH\) is bound to the head of that opposing rule.

status(?T,?H)[info->?Info].
This method provides all kinds of details about the behavior of the rule with head \(?H\) and tag \(?T\). The information returned includes candidate (if the corresponding rule is a candidate), conflictsWith(?Head), competes(?Exclusion,?Head), refutes(?Head), and rebuts(?Head).

All these methods are provided by all argumentation theories and are available in their respective modules (\(\text{gcl}\) for the default argumentation theory; for other argumentation theories, these methods are available in the modules in which these argumentation theories are loaded). However, the information returned by these methods differs from one argumentation theory to another. For instance, for the default, \(\text{sgclp}\), and \(\text{ogclp}\) theories, the method howDefeated may...
return `refutedBy(...)` and `rebuttedBy(...`, but in case of `gclpe` this method might return `notBeaterFor(ExclusionConstraintId)` as well as `canceled` and `beatenByStrictRule(?SRH)`. Here are some of the examples of these queries:

?- status(?T,configuration(0,block4,square7))[info->conflictsWith(?X)]@\gcl.
?- status(?T,configuration(nxt(nxt(0)),block4,square3))[howDefeated->?X]@\gcl.
?- status(?T,configuration(0,block4,square7))[info->competes(?Exclusion,?0)]@\gcl.

### 41 Primitive Data Types

\ERGO supports the following built-in data types: \`boolean`, \`long`, \`integer`, \`double`, \`decimal`, \`string`, \`symbol`, \`charlist`, \`iri` (international resource identifier; generalization of URLs), \`time`, \`date`, \`dateTime`, \`duration`, and \`currency`.

Following the now accepted practice on the Semantic Web, \ERGO denotes the constants that belong to a particular primitive data type using the idiom "\literal"\`type`. The \literal part represents the lexical form of the constant and the \type part is the type name. For instance, "2004-12-24"\`date", "2004-12-24T15:33:44"\`dateTime".

A type name must be a Prolog atom. Some data types, like \`time`, \`dateTime`, etc., are exact analogues of the corresponding XML Schema types. In this case, their names will be denoted using symbols that have the form of a URL. For instance, 'http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema#time'. However, for convenience, all type names will have one or more \ERGO-specific abbreviated forms, such as \`time` or \t. These abbreviated forms are case-insensitive. So, \`time` and \`TiMe` are assumed to be equivalent. In addition, when the type names have the form of an IRI, the compact prefix representation is supported (see Section 41.2 below). For instance, if \`xsd` is a prefix name for 'http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema#time' then the constant "12:33:55"\`http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema#time" can be written as "12:33:55"\`xsd#time". Taking into account the various abbreviations for this data type, we can also write it as "12:33:55"\`time" or even "12:33:55"\t".

Variables can be also \textit{typed}, i.e., restricted to be bound only to objects of a particular primitive data type. The notation is `?variable\textunderscore name`\`\textunderscore typename`. For instance, the variable `?X`\`\textunderscore time` can be bound only to constants that have the primitive type `\time`. This mechanism is more general and allows bounding of variables to arbitrary classes, not just data types; it has already been discussed in Section 10.

The methods that are applicable to each particular primitive type vary from type to type. However, certain methods are more or less common:

- `toSymbol`, which applies to a data type constant and returns its printable representation (a
Prolog atom). For instance, if ?Y is bound to "12:44:23"\time then 
?Y[toSymbol->’12:44:23’]\basetype will be true.

- toType( parameters ), which applies to any class corresponding to a primitive data type (for instance, \time). Most types will have two versions of this method. One will apply to arguments that represent the components of a data type. For instance, \time[toType(12,23,45) --> "12:23:45"\time]\basetype. The other will apply to the general constant symbol (≡ Prolog atom) representation of the data type. For instance, \time[toType(’12:23:45’)->"12:23:45"\time].

- isTypeOf( constant ), which applies to every data type class (e.g., \time) and determines whether constant has the given primitive type (\time in this example).

- equals( constant ), which tells when the given datatype constant equals some other term.

- lessThan( constant ), which tells when one constant is less than some other term. For integers, floats, time, dates, durations, and strings, this method corresponds to the natural order on these types. For other types, this method returns false.

- typeName, which tells the type name (and thus also class) of the given data type.

All these methods are available in the E\RGO system module \basetype.

In addition, each primitive data type has a built-in class associated with it. For instance, the primitive data type \integer has an associated class named \integer and the data type \dateTime has an associated class with the same name.

Note: Since built-in classes have infinite extensions, E\RGO allows only ground membership tests with respect to these classes. Non-ground tests are permitted, but evaluate to false or true depending on the situation. For instance, the following query

?- f(?X)::\symbol.

returns the answer “No.” On the other hand,

?- ?X::\integer, ?X=1. // true
?- ?X::\integer, ?X=abc. // false

If at the top level ?X in ?X::\integer remains an unbound variable, the expression should evaluate to undefined and leave ?X unbound. (Currently, though, such an expression evaluates to true). □

The following subsections describe each data type separately.
41.1 The ĖRGO symbol Data Type

Before describing the actual data types, we remind that in Section 7.1 we introduced alphanumeric constants, such as abc12, and sequences of characters enclosed in single quotes, such as 'aaa 2*)', and called them general constant symbols or Prolog atoms. These are not the only constants in ĖRGO. In the following subsections we will introduce typed literals that represent time, date, and more.

The general constant symbols mentioned above are partitioned into three subcategories: strings (class \string), IRIs (class \iri), and abstract symbols (class \symbol).

It is important to not confuse the \symbol data type with the general notion of a symbol, like “constant symbol,” “variable symbol,” or “function symbol” encountered in previous sections. The abstract symbols that are members of the \symbol data type are all the Prolog atoms that are disjoint from constants of type \iri and \string. In other words, an abstract symbol is any Prolog atom that does not serve as internal representations for the data types of the form "..."^\iri or "..."^\strings.

The class \symbol has only the following methods apart from the already mentioned toSymbol, lessThan, etc.:

- \symbol[toNumber => \number]
  When applied to a symbol that is convertible to a number, returns the result of that conversion:

  ?- '123.5'[toNumber->?R]\basetype.
  ?P = 123.5000

  ?- '456'[toNumber->?R]\basetype.
  ?P = 456

  When applied to a symbol that is not convertible to a number, issues a warning and returns the input object.
  When applied to a number, returns that number (without a warning). In all other cases, fails (returns a No).

- \symbol[concat(List) => \object]
  Note that that this is not a class-level signature, but an object level one. That is, it applies to

\footnote{For efficiency, IRIs and strings are encoded as atoms that are prefixed with a character sequence that is unlikely to be engaged by the user. IRIs are thus atoms prefixed with the character i and the backspace character; strings are atoms that are prefixed with the character s and the backspace symbol.}
the object \texttt{symbol} itself and not to the individual objects that belong to the class \texttt{symbol}. For instance,

\texttt{\texttt{ergo}\backslash symbol[concat([abc,cde,fgh])}\rightarrow?X}@\texttt{basetype}.

?X = abccdefgh

The \texttt{List} argument in the \texttt{concat} method can be a list of anything, not necessarily of other symbols. For instance,

\texttt{\texttt{ergo}\backslash symbol[concat(["11:11:11"^^\texttt{time},cde,fgh])}\rightarrow?X}@\texttt{basetype}.

?X = '11:11:11cdefgh'

41.2 The \texttt{iri} Data Type

The canonical representation of constants of type IRI (international resource identifiers, a generalization of URLs, uniform resource locators) is "\texttt{some iri}"\texttt{^^iri}, where \emph{literal} must have a lexical form corresponding to IRIs on the World Wide Web. IRIs have the shorthand notation "\texttt{some iri}", as mentioned before. The full IRI name of this type is \texttt{'http://www.w3.org/2007/rif#iri'}. IRIs can come in the usual full form or in an abbreviated form known as the \texttt{curi} form (for compact IRI).

A \texttt{compact form} of an IRI (curi) consists of a prefix and a local-name as follows: \texttt{PREFIXNAME#LOCALNAME}. Here \texttt{PREFIXNAME} is an alphanumeric identifier that must be defined as a shortcut for an IRI elsewhere (see below). \texttt{LOCALNAME} can be a string, an alphanumeric identifier, or a quoted atom. (If \texttt{LOCALNAME} contains non-alphanumeric symbols, it must be enclosed in double quotes as in "ab%20".) A compact IRI is treated as a macro that expands into a full IRI by concatenating the expansion of \texttt{PREFIXNAME} with \texttt{LOCALNAME}.

The prefix of a compact IRI must be defined in one of the following ways:

\begin{verbatim}
:- iriprefix{PREFIXNAME = PREFIXIRI}.
:- irilocalprefix{PREFIXNAME = PREFIXIRI}.
?- iriprefix{PREFIXNAME = PREFIXIRI}.
\end{verbatim}

Here \texttt{PREFIXIRI} can be an alphanumeric identifier or a quoted atom. Prefixes can also be defined at run time using a query:

\begin{verbatim}
?- iriprefix{PREFIXNAME = PREFIXIRI}.
\end{verbatim}
Such a prefix becomes defined only after the command is executed. If a prefix is used before it is defined, an error will result. For example,

```prolog
:- iriprefix{w3c = 'http://www.w3c.org/', AAAWEB = 'http://www.AAA.com/'}.
```

Defines two prefixes, which can be used in subsequent commands like this:

?- ?X = w3c#a.

This will bind ?X to "http://www.w3c.org/a". Likewise,

?- ?Y = AAAWEB#"ab%20"

binds ?Y to "http://www.AAA.com/ab%20".

**Scope of IRI prefixes: module locality.** IRI prefix definitions are local to the module where they are defined. If we define the following in module *foo*:

```prolog
:- iriprefix{W3='http://w3.org/'}.
C[a->"http://w3.org/abc"].
```

and then load the following file into module *main*

```prolog
r(?X):-?X[a->W3#abc]@foo.
s(?X):-?X[a->W3#cde].
```

then W3 will have an expansions for calls to *foo*, but not to the current module. Thus, the answer to

?- r(?X).

will be C but

?- s(?X).

will get an error saying that the prefix W3 is not defined. If the same prefix is defined both in the file and in a module being referenced by a query then the prefix definition in the current file takes precedence. For instance, if in the above example the module main had another declaration for
the IRI prefix \texttt{W3} then \texttt{?X[a->W3#abc]@foo} will use that definition rather than the one in module \texttt{foo}.

The prefix macro-expansion works also for transactional predicate and method names. For instance,

\begin{verbatim}
:- iriprefix{W3 = 'http://w3.org/'}.
C[%W3#aaa(b)].
%C[W3#r(?Y)(?X):-?X[%W3#abc(?Y)]@foo.
\end{verbatim}

Note, however, that transactional (\%\)-prefixed) symbols can occur only as the names of predicates and methods (possibly higher-order predicates and methods).

For convenience, some IRI prefixes are predefined:

\begin{verbatim}
xsd  'http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema#'
rdf  'http://www.w3.org/1999/02/22-rdf-syntax-ns#'
rdfs 'http://www.w3.org/2000/01/rdf-schema#'
owl  'http://www.w3.org/2002/07/owl#'
rif   'http://www.w3.org/2007/rif#'
swrlb 'http://www.w3.org/2003/11/swrlb#').
dc    'http://purl.org/dc/elements/1.1/').
\end{verbatim}

However, one can always override these built-in definitions using either a compile time directive \texttt{iriprefix} or a runtime query \texttt{iriprefix}.

\texttt{ERGO} also provides the necessary primitives to enable querying the available prefix definitions at run time: \texttt{prefix(\texttt{prefix},\texttt{expansion})} and \texttt{prefix(\texttt{prefix},\texttt{expansion})@module}. When \texttt{module} is not specified, the current module is assumed. When \texttt{module} is given, only the prefixes defined for the given module are returned. The aforesaid predefined prefixes are considered to be defined for every module. For example:

\begin{verbatim}
:- iriprefix{foo = 'bar.com'}. 
?- prefix(foo,\texttt{exp})@?M.
\end{verbatim}

\texttt{?exp = bar.com}
\texttt{?M = main}

\begin{verbatim}
?- prefix(\texttt{p},\texttt{exp})@main.
\end{verbatim}

\footnote{The rationale here is the theory of the “least surprise.”}
?p = foo
?exp = bar.com

?p = owl
?exp = http://www.w3.org/2002/07/owl#

?p = rdf
?exp = http://www.w3.org/1999/02/22-rdf-syntax-ns#

?p = rdfs
?exp = http://www.w3.org/2000/01/rdf-schema#

?p = rif
?exp = http://www.w3.org/2007/rif#

?p = xsd
?exp = http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema#

Scope of IRI prefixes: file locality. The iriprefix directives are global within the module. This means that these directives take effect not only in the file in which they appear, but also in all files added to the same module afterwards. Prefixes defined in the files loaded/added to module main also become known in the ERGO shell. However, if an added file has an iriprefix directive for a previously defined prefix then the new definition overrides the old one (and is inherited by all subsequently added files). Note: loading a file into a module zaps all the prefix definitions known to the module and replaces them with whatever is defined in that file.

Sometimes, however, it is preferable to have prefix definitions that are truly local to a file and are not inherited by subsequently added files. This can be done using the irilocalprefix directive. For instance, suppose file A was loaded into module Mod and has these prefix definitions:

```prolog
:- iriprefix{foo='http://123'}.  
:- iriprefix{moo='http://abc'}.  
:- iriprefix{doo='http://456'}.  
:- irilocalprefix{bar='http://cde'}.  
```

Suppose also that file B has these definitions and was added to Mod later:

```prolog
:- iriprefix{foo='http://789'}.  
:- irilocalprefix{moo='http://fgh'}.  
```
Finally, suppose file C was added later to the same module Mod. Then file A has prefixes foo, moo, doo, and bar. File B does not have prefix bar defined because it is local to file A. Moreover, prefixes foo and moo are overridden and have a different meaning than they have in file A. Prefix doo has the same meaning, however.

In file C, the situation is as follows. Prefixes foo, moo, doo are inherited. Prefix doo has the same meaning as in files A and B. However, prefix foo was overridden in file B, so it is file B’s expansion that is inherited by file C. As to prefix moo, it is inherited from file A and has the same meaning. Note that even though moo was overridden by file B, this overriding was local and did not propagate to file C.

Note that

```prolog
:- iriprefix{foo=bar}.
```

is equivalent to the pair

```prolog
:- irilocalprefix{foo=bar}.
?- iriprefix{foo=bar}.
```

The irilocalprefix directive takes case of compiling prefix foo within the given file and the executable iriprefix directive propagates the prefix to all subsequently added files (and to the ERGO shell, if applicable).

Class \iri. All constants of the primitive type IRI are members of the built-in class \iri.

The IRI data type supports the following methods, which are available in the ERGO module \basetype (or, in the abbreviated form, \btp). They are described here by their signatures.

Class methods:

- \iri[toType(\symbol) => \iri]
- \iri[=> isTypeOf(\object)]

Component methods:

- \iri[[scheme => \symbol]]
- \iri[[user => \symbol]]
• \iri[,\texttt{host} \rightarrow \texttt{symbol}]
• \iri[,\texttt{port} \rightarrow \texttt{symbol}]
• \iri[,\texttt{path} \rightarrow \texttt{symbol}]
• \iri[,\texttt{query} \rightarrow \texttt{symbol}]
• \iri[,\texttt{fragment} \rightarrow \texttt{symbol}]

Note that the exact meaning of the above components depends on the IRI scheme. For \texttt{http}, \texttt{ftp}, \texttt{file}, etc., the meaning of the first five components is clear. The query is an optional part of the IRI that follows the \texttt{?}-sign, and fragment is the last part that follows \texttt{#}. Some components might be optional for some IRI schemes. For instance, for the \texttt{urn} and \texttt{file} schemata, only the path component is defined. For the \texttt{mailto} scheme, port, path, query, and fragment are not defined. If a scheme is not recognized, then the part of the IRI that follows the scheme goes into the path component unparsed.

Other methods:

• \iri[,\texttt{toSymbol} \rightarrow \texttt{symbol}]
• \iri[,\texttt{=} \rightarrow \texttt{equals}()]
• \iri[,\texttt{typeName} \rightarrow \texttt{symbol}]

Examples:

• "\texttt{http://foo.bar.com/abc}"
• "\texttt{http://foo.bar.com/abc}"
• \iri[,\texttt{toType('http://foo.bar.com/abc')} \rightarrow
  "\texttt{http://foo.bar.com/abc}"
• \iri[,\texttt{host} \rightarrow \texttt{foo.bar.com}]\texttt{@\texttt{btp}}
41.3 The Primitive Type `dateTime`

This data type corresponds to the XML Schema `dateTime` type. The constants of this data type have the form "ZYYYY-MM-DDTHH:MM:SS.sZHH:MM." The symbols -, :, T, and . are part of the syntax. The leftmost Z is an optional sign (- ). The part that starts with the second Z is optional and represents the time zone (the second Z is a sign, which can be either + or -; note that the first Z can be only the minus sign or nothing). The part that starts with T is also optional; it represents the time of the specified day. The part of the time component of the form .s represents fractions of the second. Here s can be any positive integer.

The constants of this primitive type all belong to the class `dateTime`. The name of this type has the following synonyms: `dt`, `http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema#dateTime`.

The following methods are available in the ERGO system module `basetype`; they are described by their signatures below.

Class methods:

- `dateTime[toType(integer, integer, integer, integer, integer, integer, decimal, integer, integer, integer) => dateTime]`
  The meaning of the arguments is as follows (in that order): date sign (1 or -1), year, month, day, hour, minute, second, zone sign (1 or -1), zone hour, zone minute. All arguments, except date sign and zone sign, are assumed to be positive integers; date sign and zone sign can be either 1 or -1.

- `dateTime[toType(symbol) => dateTime]`
  Here the argument of `toType()` is expected to be a symbol (atom) of the form that is allowed inside the quotes in "..."~`dateTime`.

- `dateTime[=> isTypeOf(object)]`
  Tells if object belongs to the primitive type `dateTime`.

- `dateTime[now => dateTime]`
  Current local date+time.

- `dateTime[now(utc) => dateTime]`
  Current UTC date+time.

- `dateTime[now(decimal) => dateTime]`
  Current UTC date+time adjusted for the time zone given by the argument. The decimal argument has the form SHH.MM, where S is the plus sign (or empty) or the minus sign. If more than two MM digits are provided, the rest are cut off. If HH>24 then the query fails.
Component methods:

- `dateTime[dateSign => integer]`
- `dateTime[year => integer]`
- `dateTime[month => integer]`
- `dateTime[day => integer]`
- `dateTime[hour => integer]`
- `dateTime[minute => integer]`
- `dateTime[second => integer]`
- `dateTime[zoneSign => integer]`
- `dateTime[zoneHour => integer]`
- `dateTime[zoneMinute => integer]`
- `dateTime[date => date]`
- `dateTime[time => time]`

Other methods:

- `dateTime[toSymbol => symbol]`
- `dateTime[equals(object)]`
- `dateTime[lessThan(object)]`
- `dateTime[typeName => symbol]`
- `dateTime[add(duration) => dateTime]`
- `dateTime[minus(dateTime) => duration]`
Examples:

- `dateTime[toType('2011-10-12T12:33:55.23')->DT]@basetype` binds `DT` to "2011-10-12T12:33:55.23" `dateTime`
- "2001-11-23T12:33:55.123-02:30" `dateTime`
- "2001-11-23" `dateTime`
-="#2037-11-23T12:33:55" `dateTime`
  Note that this date refers to year 238 BCE.
- ?- "2001-11-23" `dateTime[day -> 23]@basetype`.
- ?- "2001-11-23" `dateTime[toSymbol -> '2001-11-23T00:00:00+00:00']@basetype`.
- ?- "2011-12-22+2:19" `dt[minus("2019-11-29T2:30:30-2:09" dt) -> "-P0007Y11M07DT02H30M30S" `duration]@btp

41.4 The Primitive Type `date`

This type corresponds to the XML Schema `date` type. Constants of this type have the form "ZYYYY-MM-DDSH:MM" `date`. The symbols - and : are part of the syntax. The symbol S represents the timezone sign (+ or -). The timezone part (beginning with S) is optional. The leftmost Z is the optional sign (-). Note that unlike `dateTime`, which represents a single time point, `date` represents duration of a single day.

All constants of this type belong to the built-in class `date`. The type name `date` has the following synonyms: `d`, `http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema#date`.

The following methods are defined for this type and are available through the system module `basetype`.

Class methods:

- `date[toType(integer, integer, integer, integer, integer, integer, integer) => date]`
  The meaning of the arguments is as follows (in that order): date sign (1 or -1), year, month,
day, zone sign (1 or -1), zone hour, zone minute. All arguments, except date sign and zone
sign, are assumed to be positive integers; date sign and zone sign can be either 1 or -1.

- \date[toType(\symbol) => \date]
- \date[=> isTypeOf(\object)]
  Tells if object belongs to the primitive type \date.
- \date[now => \date]
  Current local date.
- \date[now(utc) => \date]
  Current UTC date.
- \date[now(decimal) => \date]
  Current UTC date adjusted for the time zone given by the argument. The decimal argument
  has the form SHH.MM, where S is the plus sign (or empty) or the minus sign. If more than two
  MM digits are provided, the rest are cut off. If HH>24 then the query fails.

Component methods:

- \date[|dateSign => \integer|]
- \date[|year => \integer|]
- \date[|month => \integer|]
- \date[|day => \integer|]
- \date[|zoneSign => \integer|]
- \date[|zoneHour => \integer|]
- \date[|zoneMinute => \integer|]

Other methods:

- \date[|toSymbol => \symbol|]
- \date[|=> equals(\object)|]
- \date[|=> lessThan(\object)|]
- \date[|typeName => \symbol|]
- `\date[|add(\duration) => \date|]`
- `\date[|minus(\date) => \duration|]`
- `\date[|toDateTime(\integer,\integer,\decimal) => \dateTime|]`
  The arguments are hours, minutes, and seconds (with possible milliseconds).

Examples:

- "2001-11-23-2:30"
- "2001-11-23"
- "-237-11-23"
  Note that this date refers to year 238 BCE.
- ?- "2001-11-23" day -> 23@\basetype.
- ?- "2001-11-23" toSymbol -> '2001-11-23+00:00'@\basetype.
- ?- "2011-12-22" toDateTime(11,15,7.6) -> "2011-12-22T11:15:07.6" dateTime@\basetype.
- ?- "2011-12-22+2:09" d[minus("2019-10-29+3:19" d) -> "-P0007Y10M07DT00H00M00S""]@btp.
- ?- "2001-11-23-02:30" add("-P2Y2M10DT" duration) -> "1999-09-13-02:30" date@\basetype.
  Note that when adding a duration to a date, the time-part of the duration constant must be empty.

41.5 The Primitive Type `\time`

This primitive type corresponds to the XML Schema `time` data type. Constants of this type have the form "HH:MM:SS.sZHH:MM" time. The symbols : and "." are part of the syntax. The part .s is optional. It represents fractions of a second. Here s can be any positive integer. The sign Z represents the sign of the timezone (+ or -). The following HH represents time zone hours and MM time zone minutes. The time zone part is optional.

The name of this type has the following alternative versions: \t and 'http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema#time'. All constants of this type are also assumed to be members of the built-in class `\time`. 
The following methods are available for the class \texttt{time} and are provided by the module \texttt{basetype}. Their signatures are given below.

**Class methods:**

- \texttt{\texttt{time}[toType(integer, integer, decimal, integer, integer, integer) => \texttt{time}]}  
The arguments represent hour, minute, second, time zone sign, time zone hour, and time zone minute.

- \texttt{\texttt{time}[toType(symbol) => \texttt{time}]}  

- \texttt{\texttt{time}[= isTypeOf(object)]}  
  Tells if object belongs to the primitive type \texttt{time}

- \texttt{\texttt{time}[now => \texttt{time}]}  
  Current local time.

- \texttt{\texttt{time}[now(utc) => \texttt{time}]}  
  Current UTC time.

- \texttt{\texttt{time}[now(decimal) => \texttt{time}]}  
  Current UTC time adjusted for the time zone given by the argument. The decimal argument has the form \texttt{SHH.MM}, where \texttt{S} is the plus sign (or empty) or the minus sign. If more than two \texttt{MM} digits are provided, the rest are cut off. If \texttt{HH>24} then the query fails.

**Component methods:**

- \texttt{\texttt{time}[|hour => \texttt{integer}|]}  

- \texttt{\texttt{time}[|minute => \texttt{integer}|]}  

- \texttt{\texttt{time}[|second => \texttt{integer}|]}  

- \texttt{\texttt{time}[|zoneSign => \texttt{integer}|]}  

- \texttt{\texttt{time}[|zoneHour => \texttt{integer}|]}  

- \texttt{\texttt{time}[|zoneMinute => \texttt{integer}|]}  
  The arguments are years, months, and days.
Other methods:

- \time[toSymbol => \symbol]
- \time[=> equals(\object)]
- \time[=> lessThan(\object)]
- \time[typeName => \symbol]
- \time[add(\duration) => \time]
- \time[minus(\time) => \duration]
- \time[toDateTime(\integer,\integer,\integer) => \dateTime]

Examples:

- "11:24:22"^^\time
- "11:24:22"^^'http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema#time'
- ?- \time[toType(12,44,55) -> "12:44:55"^^\time]@basetype.
- ?- "12:44:55"^^\time[minute -> 44]@basetype.
- ?- "12:44:55"^^\time[toSymbol -> '12:44:55']@basetype.
- ?- "20:12:22"^^\time[toDateTime(2011,12,22) -> "2011-12-22T20:12:22"^^\dateTime]@basetype.
- ?- "11:22:33+2:22"^^\t[minus("12:23:44+2:09"^^\t) -> "-P0000Y00M00DT01H01M11S"^^\du]@btp.
- ?- "12:44:55"^^\time[add("PT2M3S"^^\duration) -> "12:46:58"^^\time]@btp.

Note that when adding a duration to a time, the date-part of the duration constant must not be present.

### 41.6 The Primitive Type \duration

The primitive type duration corresponds to the XML Schema duration data type. The constants that belong to this type have the form "sPnYnMnDTnHnMdS"^^\duration. Here s is optional sign -, P indicates that this is a duration data type, and Y, M, D, H, M, S denote year, month, day, hour,
minutes, and seconds. T separates date from time. The symbols P, Y, M, D, H, M, and S are part of the syntax. The symbol n stands for any positive integer (for instance, the number of hours can be more than 12 and the number of minutes and seconds can exceed 60) and d stands for a decimal number. The part that starts with T is optional and any element in the date and the time parts can be omitted.

The constants of this data type all belong to the class \duration.

The type name has the following synonyms: 'http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema#duration', du.

The following classes are available in module \basetype. Their signatures are shown below.

Class methods:

• \duration[toType(integer, integer, integer, integer, integer, integer, => \duration
  The meaning of the arguments (in that order) is: year, month, day, hour, minute, second.

• \duration[toType(symbol) => \duration]

• \duration[isTypeOf(object)]
  Tells if an object belongs to the primitive type \duration.

Component methods:

• \duration[year => integer]

• \duration[month => integer]

• \duration[day => integer]

• \duration[hour => integer]

• \duration[minute => integer]

• \duration[second => integer]

Other methods:

• \duration[toSymbol => symbol]

• \duration[equals(object)]
• \duration[|=> lessThan(\object)]
• \duration[|typeName => \symbol]]
• \duration[|add(\duration) => \duration]]

Examples:
• "P5Y5M10DT11H24M22S"^\duration
• ?- "-P2Y05M10DT11H24M22S"^\duration[minute -> 24]@basetype.

41.7 The Primitive Type \currency

The primitive type for currency represents the different currencies in the world. A currency constant has the form "xyz amount"^\currency, where xyz is the three-letter international symbol for the currency and amount is a number. For instance, "USD 12.4"^\currency, "GBP 21.4"^\currency, "EUR 14"^\currency. Spaces and commas are removed before the currency literal is parsed, and the currency symbol is capitalized. The currency symbol can also appear after the amount. For instance, " 12,34 5.89 ILS "^\currency gets standardized by the parser to "ILS 12345.89"^\currency.

Class methods:

• \currency[toType(\symbol,\decimal) => \currency]
  \currency[toType(\decimal,\symbol) => \currency]
The symbolic argument is expected to be a valid currency 3-letter code. The numeric argument is the amount.

• \currency[toType(\symbol) => \currency]
  Like the above but expects a single symbolic argument like 'EUR 123' or '234 KGS'.

• \currency[=> isTypeOf(\object)]
  Tells if an object belongs to the primitive type \currency.

Component methods:

• \currency[|unit => \symbol]]
The unit of the currency (e.g., USD, ZAR, JPY).
• \currency[amount => \decimal]
  The amount specified.

• \currency[description => \symbol]
  Description of the currency (e.g., Indian Rupee).

• \currency[sign => \symbol]
  The sign commonly used for the currency (e.g., '$'). Note: the same symbol is commonly used by many currencies. The $ sign is one of the most popular; it is used by over 20 currencies. Some currencies do not have a special sign, in which case null is returned.

• \currency[add(currency) => \currency]
  \currency[add(number) => \currency]
  Adds a currency constant or a number to another currency constant. If adding two currency constants, they must have the same currency unit.

• \currency[times(number) => \currency]
  Multiplies currency by a number.

• \currency[ratio(currency) => \number]
  Divides one currency constant by another currency constant; returns a number. The two currency constants must have the same currency unit.

Other methods:

• \currency[toSymbol => \symbol]
• \currency[typeName => \symbol]
• \currency[lessThan(currency)]

These methods work the same way as for other data types.

Examples: The following queries are all true:

• ?- "usd 123"^\currency[unit -> USD]\basetype.
• ?- "33 Eur"^\currency[sign -> 'â€œ']\basetype.
• ?- "33 GBP"^\currency[amount -> 33]\basetype.
• ?- "ILS 36"^\currency[description -> 'New Israeli Sheqel']\basetype.
41.8 The Primitive Type \boolean

This corresponds to the XML Schema boolean type. Constants of this type have the form "true" \boolean "false" \boolean or the shorter form \true, \false. A synonym for the \boolean type name is 'http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema#boolean'.

All constants in this type belong to the built-in class \boolean. The following methods are available in module \basetype.

Class methods:

- \boolean[toSymbol => \symbol]
- \boolean[=> isTypeOf(\object)]

Other methods:

- \boolean[toSymbol => \symbol]
- \boolean[=> equals(\object)]
- \boolean[=> lessThan(\object)]
  
Note: \false[lessThan(\true)].

- \boolean[typeName => \symbol]
- \boolean[rawValue => \symbol]

Extract the content value from the \boolean data type. For instance,

?- "true" \boolean[rawValue=>?X] @\basetype.

?X = true

41.9 The Primitive Type \double

This corresponds to the XML Schema type double. The constants in this type all belong to the class \double and have the form "value" \double, where value is a floating point number that uses the regular decimal point representation with an optional exponent. Doubles have a short form where the "..." \double wrapper is removed.
In ERGO, the `\float` and `\double` type designators are interchangeable, and the constants of these data types are treated as regular floating point numbers. This means that, for example, "1.2"^\double, "1.2"^\float, and 1.2 represent the same number.

This type name has a synonym 'http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema#double'. The following methods are available for type `\double` in module `basetype`.

Class methods:

- \double[toType(\decimal) => \double]
  Converts decimals to doubles. Error, if overflow.

- \double[toType(\long) => \double]
  Converts long integers to doubles.

- \double[toType(\string) => \double]
  \double[toType(\symbol) => \double]
  Converts strings and symbols into doubles, if the textual representation of these values is a number.

- \double[=> isTypeOf(\object)]

Instance methods:

- \double[floor => \integer]

- \double[ceiling => \integer]

- \double[round => \integer]

Other methods:

- \double[toSymbol => \symbol]

- \double[=> equals(\object)]

- \double[=> lessThan(\object)]

- \double[typeName => \symbol]

- \double[rawValue => \double]
  Extract the number part of the `\double` data type.
Examples: "2.50"\double, 2.50, 25E-1 — different forms of \double.
?- "3.54"\double[round->?X]\basetype. // answer: ?X = 4,
?- 5.51[floor->?X]\basetype. // answer: ?X = 5,
?- \double[toType(51)->?X]\basetype. // ?X = 51.0000 — long-to-double conversion.

41.10 The Primitive Type \long

This data type corresponds to XML Schema’s long integers. The constants in this data type belong to class \long and have the form "value"\long, where value is an integer in its regular representation in the decimal system. A shorter form without the "..."\long wrapper is also allowed. This type name has a synonym: 'http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema#long'.

Class methods:

- \long[toType(\symbol) => \long]
- \long[toType(\symbol) => \long]
  Converts strings to long integers, if the string represents an integer in textual form. If it does not then this method fails.
- \long[toType(\integer) => \long]
  Converts long integers to arbitrary big integers.
- \long[=> isTypeOf(\object)]

Other methods:

- \long[|toSymbol => \symbol|]
- \long[|=> equals(\object)|]
- \long[|=> lessThan(\object)|]
- \long[|typeName => \symbol|]
- \long[|rawValue => \long|]
  Extract the number part of the \long data type.

Examples: 123, 55, "55"\long.
41.11 The Primitive Types \texttt{decimal, number, integer, and short}

At present, ERGO does not implement the \texttt{decimal} and the \texttt{integer} types, which correspond to XML Schema arbitrary precision types decimal and integer. Instead, \texttt{decimal} and \texttt{number} are synonyms for \texttt{double}, while \texttt{short} and \texttt{integer} for \texttt{long}, which are described in previous subsections. As usual, there are corresponding classes \texttt{integer}, \texttt{short}, \texttt{number}, and \texttt{decimal}.

41.12 The Primitive Type \texttt{string}

This corresponds to the XML Schema type string. The constants in this class belong to type \texttt{string} and the type name has the synonym \url{http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema#string}. The values of this class have the form "value"\^\texttt{string}. Alphanumeric strings that start with a letter do not need to be quoted. In the full representation (with the "..."\^\texttt{string} wrapper), the double quote symbol and the backslash must be escaped with a backslash.

The following methods are available in module \texttt{basetype}:

Class methods:

- \texttt{string[=> isTypeOf(object)]}
- \texttt{string[toType(object) => string]}

Note that the method \texttt{toType} in class \texttt{string} can be used to serialize any term as a string. For instance,

\begin{verbatim}
   ergo> \string[toType(abc(cde))->?val]@\basetype.

   ?val = "abc(cde)"^^\string
\end{verbatim}

Instance methods:

- \texttt{string[\texttt{contains(string)}]}\texttt{[]}
  Tells if the second string (or symbol) is contained in the first.

- \texttt{string[\texttt{contains(string) => list}]}\texttt{[]}
  Tells if the second string (or symbol) is contained in the first. The result is returns as a list of two numbers: the position of the beginning of the match and of the end of the match. Positions start with 1.
- `\texttt{\textbackslash string[|concat(\textbackslash string) => \textbackslash string]}`  

- `\texttt{\textbackslash string[|reverse => \textbackslash string]}`  

- `\texttt{\textbackslash string[|length => \textbackslash integer]}`  

- `\texttt{\textbackslash string[|toUpper => \textbackslash string]}`  

- `\texttt{\textbackslash string[|toLower => \textbackslash string]}`  

- `\texttt{\textbackslash string[|=> startsWith(\textbackslash string)]}`  

- `\texttt{\textbackslash string[|=> endsWith(\textbackslash string)]}`  

- `\texttt{\textbackslash string[|substring(\integer,\integer) => \textbackslash string]}`  

  Returns a substring of the object string, where the starting and the ending position of the substring are given by the arguments of the method. -1 in argument 2 means the end of the string.

Other methods:

- `\texttt{\textbackslash string[|=> equals(\object)]}`  

- `\texttt{\textbackslash string[|=> lessThan(\object)]}`  

- `\texttt{\textbackslash string[|typeName => \symbol]}`

Examples:

- "abc"^^\textbackslash string  

- 'a string\n''\textbackslash string  

- "a\string\b"^^\textbackslash string  

- "string with a 'quoted' substring"^^\textbackslash string  

- ?- "abc"^^\string[concat("bbb"^^\string)-->?X]\@\texttt{basetype}.
  ?X = "abcbbb"^^\textbackslash string

Note that internally the string "abc"^^\textbackslash string and the atom 'abc' are different. To extract the actual pure Prolog atom (stripped from the internal stuff), use the method rawValue. For instance, ?- "abc"^^\string[rawValue-->?X]\@\texttt{basetype}.
41.13 The Primitive Type \texttt{list}

This is the usual Prolog list type. The members of this type have the form "\texttt{[elt1, ..., eltn]}" \texttt{^\texttt{\texttt{list}}} (short form \texttt{[elt1, ..., eltn]}) and belong to class \texttt{list}.

The following methods are available from the standard module \texttt{basetype}:

Class methods:

- \texttt{\texttt{list}}[\rightarrow \texttt{isTypeOf} (\texttt{object})]
- \texttt{\texttt{list}}[\rightarrow \texttt{toType} (\texttt{list}) \rightarrow \texttt{list}]

Other methods:

- \texttt{\texttt{list}}[\rightarrow \texttt{contains} (\texttt{list})]
  
  Tells if a list object contains the method's argument as a sublist.
  
  Since checking list containment is a very common operation, this method has a special shortcut \texttt{\texttt{sublist}}:

  \begin{verbatim}
  ?- [b,?A] \texttt{\texttt{sublist}} [b,c,a,d].
  ?A = c
  ?A = a
  ?A = d
  [1,2,4] \texttt{\texttt{sublist}} [1,2,3,4].
  Yes
  \end{verbatim}

- \texttt{\texttt{list}}[\rightarrow \texttt{member} (\texttt{object})]
  
  The method's argument and the list-object may not be fully ground. In this case, the method succeeds if the argument to the method unifies with a member of the list.
  
  Since checking list membership is a very common operation, this method has a special shortcut \texttt{\texttt{in}}:

  \begin{verbatim}
  ?- a \texttt{\texttt{in}} [b,c,a,d].
  Yes
  \end{verbatim}

  The same operator can also be used to check for numeric and other ranges:

  \begin{verbatim}
  ?- 5.1 \texttt{\texttt{in}} 2.1..6.7.
  \end{verbatim}
Note that the range expression 2.1 .. 6.7 is basically a list [2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1], so 5.1 is in it, but, say, 5.2 is not. To see what kind of a list is represented by a range expression, leave the left-hand side of the \in operator unbound:

?- ?X \in 3..5.
?X = 3
?X = 4
?X = 5

See Section 15 for more.

- \list[|select(object) => \list|]
  Find an member in list that unifies with the object-argument and return the list with the selected member removed. For instance,

  \[\text{- "[a,b(1),c,b(2)]"^^\list[select(b(?X))]->?R}@btp.}\]

  ?X = 1
  ?R = [a, c, b(2)]

  ?X = 2
  ?R = [a, b(1), c]

- \list[|delete(object) => \list|]
  Delete all occurrences of the object in list. Selection is made using ==, not unification. For instance,

  \[\text{- [a,b(1),c,b(?X),b(1)]}[delete(b(?X))]->?R}@btp.\]

  ?X = ?_h4800
  ?R = [a, b(1), c, b(1)]

  Note that \text{b(?X)} was deleted, but not \text{b(1)}. On the other hand,

  \[\text{- "[a,b(1),c,b(1)]"^^\list[delete(b(1))]->?R}@btp.}\]

  ?R = [a, c]

  i.e., all occurrences of \text{b(1)} are deleted.

- \list[|append(list) => \list|]
  Appends one list to another and returns the resulting list.
- `\list[append(\list) => \list]`
  Here the signature is attached directly to `\list` as an object. This means that the `append` method applies directly to class `\list`. In this case, it takes a `list of lists` and returns the list that is the result of appending the lists found in that argument list of lists. For instance

  ```prolog
  ?- \list[append(["[a,b]"\list],[c,d],["[e,f]"\list])]-?R@\btp.
  ?R = [a, b, c, d, e, f]
  ```

- `\list[i\th(\integer) => \object]`
  Given a list, returns the object in the `i`th position. If the position is a variable, returns the position in the list at which the result-object is found. If both the position and the object are variables, enumerates all elements in the list and their position number.

- `\list[length => \long]`
  Computes the length of the list.

- `\list[reverse => \list]`

- `\list[sort => \list]`

- `\list[startsWith(\list)]`

- `\list[endsWith(\list)]`

- `\list[subset(\list)]`
  True if the list object contains the argument list without regard to the order (i.e., treating lists as sets). This method has a convenient shortcut in `ERGO`, `\subset`. For instance,

  ```prolog
  ?- [3,2,1] \subset [1,4,5,3,2,9]. // true
  ```

Other methods:

- `\list[to\Symbol => \symbol]`

- `\list[equals(\object)]`

- `\list[typeName => \symbol]`
Examples:

- \([a, b, c]\)
- \([a, b|?X]\)
- \([a, b, c|[d, e]]\)
- "\([a, b, c]\)"\list
- "\([a, b|?X]\)"\list
- "\([a, b, c|[d, e]]\)"\list

As in Prolog, the part of a list term that follows the bar | represents the tail of the list.

### 41.14 Character Lists

ERGO character lists, \charlists, are represented as "..."\charlist. Since character lists are... lists, they can also be represented using the list notation. For instance, \([102, \text{111}, \text{111}]\) is the same as "\text{foo}"\charlist. The main reason for the existence of the \charlist data type is that writing "\text{foo}"\charlist is a lot easier than consulting the ASCII table to find the numeric code for each character in order to write \([102, \text{111}, \text{111}]\). In addition, expert users can simply write "\text{foo}", but this syntax is disabled by default because novice users tend to not understand this data structure and misuse it in various ways.

**Do not** confuse character lists with symbols: symbols are not lists and have a completely different representation and one should never use charlists in place of symbols. Character lists are useful in situations when it is necessary to parse the contents of a sequence of characters.

Escape sequences and Unicode are recognized inside ERGO charlists similarly to ERGO symbols. However, inside a charlist, a single quote character does not need to be escaped. A double quote character, however, needs to be escaped by another double quote, e.g., ""\text{foo}"", or by a backslash.

**Instance methods.** All methods applicable to the \list datatype are also applicable to charlists. In addition, some methods applicable to the datatype \string also apply to character lists:

- \charlist[|substring(integer, integer) => \charlist]
- \charlist[|toUpperCase => \charlist]
- \charlist[|toLowerCase => \charlist]
- \charlist[|concat(charlist) => charlist]
Class methods. The usual class-level methods likewise apply to charlists:

- \charlist[\toType(\charlist) => \charlist]
- \charlist[\isTypeOf(\object)]

41.15 Special Classes for Callable Literals

In addition to the above, \ERGO provides the following builtin meta-classes:

- \modular — this is a class for atomic formulas whose truth value depends on the module. This includes F-logic molecules, HiLog predicates, and Prolog predicates declared as :- prolog or :- table. For instance, \{a[b\to c]\}::\modular is true.

- \callable — this class includes all atomic formulas that can possibly have a truth value in \ERGO. It includes \modular formulas as well as various \prolog formulas and builtin primitives like isinteger{...}.
\callable does exclude terms that, by their semantics, are not supposed to be truth-valued. These include HiLog terms (as opposed to HiLog predicates), datatype constants, and builtin class names. For instance, \{p(b,?X)\}::\callable and isinteger{...}::\callable are true, but p(b,?X)::\callable and "abc"^r^f^o^o^b^a^r::\callable are false. The former is false because p(b,?X) in a HiLog term, not a predicate, and the latter is false because "abc"^r^f^o^o^b^a^r is a datatype constant.

In both cases, if the class member being tested is a variable then the result is \undefined unless this is a typed variable of the matching type. For instance, ?X::\modular is \undefined, but ?x^r^c^a^l^l^e^a^b::\callable is \true.

41.16 User-defined Types

\ERGO also supports user-defined types. A user-defined type can be any atom, say foo, that is not reserved for the builtin types, i.e., is not prefixed with a “\". A literal of a user-defined type, such as foo, has the form "some string"^r^f^o^o, i.e., it has the same form as the built-in data types. However, \ERGO does not prescribe the contents of the data type and, at present, there is no hook to let the user plug in a personal parser to sort out which literals belongs to the data type and which do not.

Typed variables, introduced in Section 10, also work with user-defined types. Since foo may denote a class, a user-defined type, or both, such a variable, ?x^r^c^a^l^l^e^a^b::foo binds to both the members of the class foo and the literals of type foo. For example,
{a,b}:foo.

?- a=?X^^foo.  // true
?- "abc"^^foo=?X^^foo.  // true
?- d=?X^^foo.  // false: d is not in class foo
?- "abc"^^moo=?X^^foo.  // false: type mismatch
?- "abc"^^foo=?X^(foo;moo).  // false: don’t use foo both as a class & type
?- insert{"abc"^^foo:foo}, "abc"^^foo=?X^(foo;moo).  // true

However, it is not recommended to use the same symbol both as a class and as a user-defined type at the same time in the same module. For example, in the next-to-last example above, foo is used as a class in the expression ?X^^(foo;moo), so it will not unify with the literal of type foo unless "abc"^"foo is a member of the class foo. That last possibility is illustrated by the last line in the above example.

### 41.17 Regular Expression Matching

Regular expression matching is important in many applications. ERGO provides convenient facilities for such operations based on the well-known PCRE package, which supports Perl-style extended regular expressions, which are documented at this RL: [http://perldoc.perl.org/perlre.html#Regular-Expressions](http://perldoc.perl.org/perlre.html#Regular-Expressions). The Web contains many sites that include various tutorials for this type of expressions.

On Linux and Mac, in order to use the pattern matching facility, PCRE must be installed before ERGO is installed. On Windows, PCRE gets installed together with ERGO, so the below instructions can be skipped.

To install PCRE on Linux, use the system’s package manager and search for pcre. The names of the packages differ from distribution to distribution. On Debian, Ubuntu, and Mint, two packages need to be installed: libpcre and libpcre-dev; on Fedora, the package is pcre-devel; on the Mac, use Homebrew to install the pcre package.

If, on Linux or Mac, ERGO was installed first and PCRE is installed afterwards, ERGO suite must be reconfigured as follows: change to the top directory of the ERGO suite (the one that has Ergo and XSB as subdirectory) and then execute

```
sh ./Ergo/ergosuite_config.sh
```

Follow the prompts.

---

Pattern matching commands. Like other string and symbol operations, ERGO provides the pattern matching facility through its `\basetype` (or `\btp`) module. Three API calls are supported:

- `?Symbol [matchOne(?Pattern) -> ?Result]`: find the first match. Here `?Symbol` must be a Prolog atom (which includes the data types `\url`, `\string`, or `\symbol`); it is a string to be matched against the `?Pattern` regular expression—also a Prolog atom that represents a Perl regular expression. **Important**: Perl regular expressions include various keywords that start with a backslash, e.g., `\d`. These backslashes must be doubled in `?Pattern`, i.e., `\\d`.

  `?Result` is a HiLog term of the form `match(?Match,?Prematch,?Postmatch,?Submatches)`, that represents the first match. Here the first argument, `?Match`, is the substring of `?Symbol` that matches the pattern; `?Prematch` is the substring of `?Match` that precedes `?Match`; `?Postmatch` is the substring that follows `?Match`; and `?Submatches` is a list of submatches. These submatches are substrings of the pattern that match the subpatterns of `?Pattern` that are enclosed in parentheses (see the examples below).

- `?Symbol [matchAll(?Pattern) -> ?Result]`: find all matches. Here `?Symbol` and `?Pattern` are as before and `?Result` is a list of the terms of the form `match(?Match,?Prematch,?Postmatch,?Submatches)` described above.


Examples:

```prolog
ergo> 'Hello12345-6789 NYwalk'[matchOne('\\d{5}-\\d{4}\ [A-Z]{2}')->?R]\btp.
?R = match('12345-6789 NY',Hello,walk,['12345-6789'])

ergo> 'a@b.com@c.net@d.edu'[matchAll('[a-z]+@[a-z]+.(com|net|edu)')->?Result]\btp.
?Result = [match('a@b.com',,'@c.net@d.edu',,[com]),
            match('com@c.net',,'a@b.', '@d.edu',,[net]),
            match('om@c.net',,'a@b.c', '@d.edu',,[net]),
            match('m@c.net',,'a@b.co', '@d.edu',,[net]),
            match('net@d.edu',,'a@b.com@c.',,[edu]),
            match('et@d.edu',,'a@b.com@c.n',,[edu]),
            match('t@d.edu',,'a@b.com@c.ne',,[edu])]

ergo> 'This is a Mississippi issue'[substitute(is,was)->?Result]\btp.
?Result = 'Thwas was a Mwasswassissippi wassue'
```
42  Cardinality Constraints

The earlier versions of F-logic made a distinction between functional and set-valued attributes and methods. The former were allowed to have only one value for any particular object and the latter could have any. In ERGO, this dichotomy was replaced with the much more general mechanism of cardinality constraints. These constraints can be specified in signature expressions, which we have earlier used only to define types of attributes and methods. The extended syntax is as follows:

\[
C1[Meth\{LowerBound..UpperBound\}=>C2] \\
C1[\{\{\}Meth\{LowerBound..UpperBound\}=>C2\}]
\]

The first signature applies to object \(C1\) and to its method \(Meth\). The second expression is a class-level statement, so it applies to all members of \(C1\) (now viewed as a class) and to all subclasses of \(C1\).

The lower and upper bounds in cardinality constraints can be non-negative integers, variables, or the symbol * (which denotes infinity). Variables can occur in signatures in rule bodies, which is useful especially when one wants to query the bounds of the cardinality constraints.

For example,

\[?- c1[m\{2..?X\}=>c2].\]

means that the method \(m\) of class \(c1\) must have at least 2 at most 3 values. Similarly,

\[c1[m\{2..*\}=>c2].\]

means that \(m\) has at least 2 values; there is no upper bound.

We can query the specified cardinality constraints by putting variables in the appropriate places. For instance, consider the following knowledge base loaded into module \(foo\):

\[
C[\{m\{3..\}=>B\}]. \\
C[m\{?x..1\}=>B] :- ?x=0. \\
v:C. \\
v2:C. \\
v2:C2. \\
C[m->{1,2}]. \\
v[m->2]. \\
C2[\{m->{1,2,3}\}].
\]
The query

?- ?C[?M{?L..?H}=>?]|foo.

will yield three solutions:

?C = C
?M = m
?L = 0
?H = 1

?C = v
?M = m
?L = 3
?H = *

?C = v2
?M = m
?L = 3
?H = *

Note that the objects v and v2 are in the answer to the query because they inherited the cardinality constraint from the first clause, C|[m3..*=>B|].

On the other hand, the query

?- ?C[|?M{?L..?H}=>?]|@foo.

has two solutions:

?C = C
?M = m
?L = 3
?H = *

?C = C2
?M = m
?L = 3
?H = *

Class C is in the result because the constraint is specified explicitly and C2 is in the result because it inherited the constraint from C.
43 Exception Handling

\(\text{ERGO}\) supports the common catch/throw paradigm through the primitives \(\text{catch}\{?\text{Goal}, ?\text{Error},\ ?\text{Handler}\}\) and \(\text{throw}\{?\text{Error}\}\). Here \(?\text{Goal}\) can be any \(\text{ERGO}\) query, \(?\text{Error}\) is a HiLog (or Prolog) term, and \(?\text{Handler}\) is a \(\text{ERGO}\) query that will be called if an exception that unifies with \(?\text{Error}\) is thrown during the execution of \(?\text{Goal}\). For instance,

\[
\text{%someQuery(?Y)} :- \ ?Y[\text{value->?X}], \ ?X > 0, \ %\text{doSomethingUseful(?X)}.
\]

\[
\text{%someQuery(?Y)} :- \ ?Y[\text{value->?X}], \ ?X =< 0, \ \text{throw}\{\text{myError('?X non-positive', ?X)}\}.
\]

\[- \ %\text{p(?Y)}, \ \text{catch}\{\%\text{someQuery(?Y), myError(?Reason,?X)}\}, \ %\text{handleException(?Reason,?X)}\}.
\]

\[
\%\text{handleException(?Reason,?X)} :-
\qquad \text{format(''-w: \ ?X=\-w\-n',,[?Reason,?X])@\text{prolog(format), \false}.}
\]

The catch construct first calls the query \%\text{someQuery/1}. If \(?X\) is positive then nothing special happens, the query executes normally, and \text{catch}\{\ldots\} has no effect. However, if \(?X\) turns out to be non-positive then the query throws an exception \text{myError('?X non-positive', ?X)}, where \(?X\) is bound to the non-positive value that was deemed by the logic of the program to be an exceptional situation. The term thrown as an exception is then unified with the term \text{myError(?Reason,?X)} that was specified in \text{catch}\{\ldots\}. If the two terms do not unify (e.g., if the error specified in \text{catch} was something like \text{myError(foo,?X)}) then the exception is propagated upwards and if the user does not explicitly catch it, the exception will eventually be caught by the \(\text{ERGO}\) command loop. In the above example, however, the thrown term and the exception specified in \text{catch} unify and thus \%\text{handleException/2} is called with \?Reason and \?X bound by this unification.

The queries \(?\text{Goal}\) and \(?\text{Handler}\) in the \text{catch}\{\ldots\} primitive can be frames, not just predicates. However, \(?\text{Error}\) — both in \text{catch} and in \text{throw} — must be HiLog or Prolog terms. No frame literals are allowed inside these terms unless they are reified. That is, \text{myError('problem found', a[b->c])} will result in a parser error, but an exception of the form \text{myError('problem found', $\{a[b->c]\})} is correct because the frame is reified.

Some exceptions are thrown by \(\text{ERGO}\) itself, and applications might want to catch them:

- \text{'$\text{ergo_undefined'}(?\text{MethodSpec},?\text{ErrMsg})\} — thrown when undefinedness checking is in effect (see Section 45.1) and an attempt is made to execute an undefined method or predicate. The first argument in the thrown exception is a specification of the undefined predicate or the method that caused the exception. The second argument is the error message.

- \text{'$\text{ergo_abort'}\) or \text{'$\text{ergo_abort'}(?\text{Message})\} — thrown when \(\text{ERGO}\) encounters other kinds of errors. This exception comes in two flavors: with an error message and without.
A rule can also throw this exception when immediate exit to the top level is required. The safest way to do so is by calling `abort(?Message)\sys`, as explained in Section 48.3.

These exceptions are defined by ERGO under the symbolic names `ERGO_UNDEFINED_EXCEPTION` and `ERGO_ABORT`. When a user application needs to catch these errors we recommend that the applicable files include `flora_exceptions.flh` and use the above symbolic names. For instance,

```prolog
#include "flora_exceptions.flh"
?- ..., catch{myQuery(?Y),
          ERGO_ABORT(ERGO_UNDEFINED_EXCEPTION(?MethSpec,?Message),?_),
          myHandler(?MethSpec)}.
?- ..., catch{yourQuery(?Y),ERGO_ABORT(?Message,?_),yourHandler(?Message)}.
```

The `catch{...}` primitive can also catch exceptions thrown by the underlying Prolog system. For this to happen you need to know the format of the exceptions thrown by Prolog (which can be found in the manual). These exceptions have the form

```
error(errortype(arguments),context(Message,Backtrace))
```

However, ERGO aims to intercept all Prolog exceptions and contextualize them in the appropriate ERGO terms and any non-caught Prolog exception should be treated as an omission to be fixed in the next release.

## 44 The Compile-time Preprocessor

ERGO supports a C-style preprocessor, which is invoked during the compilation. The most important commands are

```prolog
#define variable value
#define macro(arg_1,...,arg_n) expression
#if variable
#ifndef variable
#else
#endif
#include "file"
```

There are many features that go beyond the C preprocessor such as the tests

```prolog
#include "flora_exceptions.flh"
?- ..., catch{myQuery(?Y),
          ERGO_ABORT(ERGO_UNDEFINED_EXCEPTION(?MethSpec,?Message),?_),
          myHandler(?MethSpec)}.
?- ..., catch{yourQuery(?Y),ERGO_ABORT(?Message,?_),yourHandler(?Message)}.
```
and many others. For example, it is possible to enable macro substitution inside quotes. An advanced user is referred to the XSB manual where this preprocessor, called gpp, is described in an appendix to Manual 1.

45 Debugging User Knowledge bases

ERGO comes with an interactive, Prolog-style debugger, which is described in Appendix B. The compiler makes many useful checks, such as the occurrence of singleton variables, which is often an error (see Section 7.1). When a problem is deemed serious enough, errors are reported.

The most important rule in debugging ERGO knowledge bases is: never ignore any kind of warnings issued by system. This golden rule actually applies to programming in any language. In addition, it is possible to tell ERGO to perform various run-time checks, as described below.

45.1 Checking for Undefined Methods and Predicates

ERGO has support for checking for the invocation of undefined methods and predicates at run time. This feature can be of great help because a trivial typo can cause a method/predicate call to fail, sending the user on a wild goose chase after a hard-to-find bug. It should be noted, however, that enabling these checks can slow the runtime by up to 2 times (typically about 50% though), so we recommend that this be done during debugging only.

To enable runtime checks for undefined invocations, ERGO provides two methods, which can be called at any time during execution (and thus enable and disable the checks dynamically):

?- Method[mustDefine(?Flag)]@\sys.
?- Method[mustDefine(?Flag(?Module))]@\sys.

The argument ?Flag can be on, off, or it can be a variable. The argument ?Module must be a valid loaded ERGO module name or it can be a variable. When the flag argument is on, the first method turns on the checks for undefinedness in all modules. The second method does it in a specific module. When the flag argument is off, the above methods turn the undefinedness checks off globally or in a specific module, respectively.

When either ?Flag or ?Module (or both) is a variable, the above methods do not change the way undefined calls are treated. Instead, they query the state of the system. For instance, in

?- Method[mustDefine(?Flag)]@\sys.
?- Method[mustDefine(?Flag(foo))]@\sys.
?- Method[mustDefine(on(?Module))]@\sys.
the first query binds \( \texttt{Flag} \) to \texttt{on} or \texttt{off} depending on whether the checks are turned on or off globally. The second query reports on the state of the undefinedness checks in \texttt{ERGO} module \texttt{foo}, while the third query tells in which modules these checks are turned on.

In addition to turning on/off the checks for undefinedness on the per-module basis, \texttt{ERGO} provides a way to turn off such checks for individual predicates and methods:

\[- \texttt{Method[mustDefine(on, Predicate/Method-spec)]@sys.} \]

For example,

\[- \texttt{Method[mustDefine(on, ?(?@foo))@sys.} \]

specifies that all undefinedness errors of predicates that unify with \texttt{?(?@foo)} are ignored, provided that \texttt{foo} is a loaded module. Note that the module must always be specified. For instance, to ignore undefinedness checking in the current module, use

\[- \texttt{Method[mustDefine(on, ?(?@\@))@sys.} \]

The use of the current module symbol \texttt{\@} is essential in this example. Omitting it is probably not what you want because the module specification \texttt{\sys} propagates inward and so the above statement (without the \texttt{\@}) would turn off undefinedness checks in module \texttt{\sys} instead of the current module.

One can also turn undefinedness checks off in all modules by putting a variable in the module position:

\[- \texttt{Method[mustDefine(on, ?(?@ ?Mod))@sys.} \]

However, this must not be an anonymous variable like \texttt{?}, \texttt{?-}, or a don’t care variable like \texttt{?_Something}. If one uses an anonymous or a don’t-care variable then undefinedness checks will be ignored only in some randomly picked module.

A pair of parentheses is needed when multiple predicates/methods are listed in one call.

\[- \texttt{Method[mustDefine(on, (?:class@foo, ?[?]%@ \@))@sys.} \]

The undefinedness exception in \texttt{ERGO} can be caught using \texttt{ERGO}'s \texttt{catch{...}} built-in. For instance, suppose \texttt{FOO} is a predicate or a frame whose execution might trigger the undefinedness exception. Then we can catch this exception as follows:
#include "flora_exceptions.flh"

..., catch{FOO, \FLUNDEFEXCEPTION(?Call,?ErrorMessage), handler(?Call)}, ...

Here ERGO_UNDEFINED_EXCEPTION is the exception name defined in the ERGO system file flora_exceptions.flh, which must be included as shown. The predicate handler/1 is user-defined (can be a frame as well), which will be called when an undefinedness exception occurs. The variable ?Call will be bound to an internal representation of the method or predicate call that caused the exception. For instance, if we define

handler(?_) :- !.

then the undefinedness exception that occurs while executing FOO will be ignored and the call to FOO will succeed.

Undefinedness checks and meta-programming. We should note one subtle interaction between these checks and meta-programming. Suppose the user knowledge base does not have any class membership facts and the undefinedness checks are turned on. Then the meta-query

?- a:?X.

would cause the following error:

++Error[Ergo]: Undefined class ?:? in user module main

Likewise, if the knowledge base does not have any method definitions, the query $?- ?X[?Y->?Z]. would cause an error. This might not be what one expects because the application in question might be exploring the schema or the available data, and the intention in the above cases might be to fail rather than to get an error.

One way of circumventing this problem is to insert some “weird” facts into the knowledge base and special-case them. For instance, one could add the following facts to silence the above errors:

ads_asd_fsffdfd : ads_asd_fsffdfd.
ads_asd_fsffdfd[ads_asd_fsffdfd -> ads_asd_fsffdfd].

The user can then arrange the things so that anything that contains ads_asd_fsffdfd would be discarded.

Another way to circumvent the problem is to turn the undefinedness checks off temporarily. For instance, suppose the query $?- ?X:a causes an unintended undefinedness error in module foo. Then we can avoid the problem by posing the following query instead:
??? Method[mustDefine(on(foo))]@\sys.

A more selective way to circumvent this problem is to turn off undefinedness checking just for the offending classes. For instance,

??? Method[mustDefine(off(?,?:a@show)])@\sys.

The fourth way is to deal with the exception is to use $\text{ERGO}$’s `catch{...} ` built-in (note the curly braces):

```
#include "flora_exception.flh"

?- catch{?X:a, FLUNDEFEXCEPTION(?X,?):a@\prolog, true}.
```

**Undefinedness checks and update operators.** Although undefinedness checking can be turned on and off at will, it cannot always capture all cases correctly. Namely, if an insert or delete statement is executed while undefinedness checking is off, the corresponding methods will not be properly captured and spurious undefinedness errors might result. For instance, if

??- insert{a[meth->b]}, delete{a[meth->b]}.
??? Method[mustDefine(on)]@\sys.

are executed then the query `?- a[meth->b]` will cause the undefinedness error. However,

??- insert{a[meth->b]}, delete{a[meth->b]}.
??? Method[mustDefine(on)]@\sys.
??? a[meth->b].

will not flag the method `meth` as undefined.

### 45.2 Type Checking

Although $\text{ERGO}$ allows specification of object types through signatures, type correctness is not checked automatically. A future version of $\text{ERGO}$ might support some form of run-time type checking. Nevertheless, run-time type checking is possible even now, although you should not expect any speed here and this should be done during debugging only.
Run-time type checking is possible because F-logic naturally supports powerful meta-programming, although currently the knowledge engineer has to do some work to make type checking happen. For instance, one can write simple queries to check the types of methods that might look suspicious. Here is one way to construct such a type-checking query:

```prolog
type_error(?O,?M,?R,?D) :-
  %% Values that violate typing
  ;
  %% Defined methods that do not have type information
?- type_error(?Obj,?Meth,?Result,?Class).
```

Here, we define what it means to violate type checking using the usual F-logic semantics. The corresponding predicate can then be queried. A “no” answer means that the corresponding attribute does not violate the typing rules.

In this way, one can easily construct special purpose type checkers. This feature is particularly important when dealing with semistructured data. (Semistructured data has object-like structure but normally does not need to conform to any type; or if it does, the type would normally cover only certain portions of the object structure.) In this situation, one might want to limit type checking only to certain methods and classes, because other parts of the data might not be expected to have regular structure.

Note that in a multi-module knowledge base, the module information should be added to the various parts of the above type-checker. It is reasonable to assume that the schema information and the definition for the same object resides in the same module (a well-designed knowledge base is likely to satisfy this requirement). In this case, a type-checker that take the module information into account can be written as follows:

```prolog
type_error(?O,?M,?R,?D) :-
  %% Values that violate typing
  (?O[?M->?R], ?O[?M=>?D])@?Mod1, naf ?R:?D@?Mod1
  ;
  %% Defined methods that do not have type information
?- type_error(?Obj,?Meth,?Result,?Class).
```

We should note that type-checking queries in ERGO are likely to work only for “pure” queries, i.e., ones that do not involve built-ins like arithmetic expressions. Built-ins pose a problem because they typically expect certain variable binding patterns when these built-ins are called. This assumption may not hold when one asks queries as general as type_error.
To facilitate all these checks, ERGO provides a method, check, in class Type of module `typecheck` (which can be abbreviated to `tpck`). Its syntax is:

?- Type[check(?Specification, ?Result)]@\typecheck.
?- Type[check(?Specification, ?Result)]@tpck.

The `?Specification` variable must be bound to a base frame, as described below. `?Result` gets bound to the evidence of type violation (one or two atoms that violate the typing constraint).

- If `?Specification` is of the form `?[?Meth->?]@?Mod` then all type constraints for `?Meth` are checked in module `?Mod`. Missing types (semistructured data) are flagged. If `?Mod` is an unbound variable, then the constraints are checked in all modules. `?Meth` can also be a variable. In this case all non-transactional methods will be checked.

- If `?Specification` is of the form `?[?Meth=>?]@?Mod` then the type constraints for `?Meth` are checked in module `?Mod` but missing types (semistructured data) are ignored. As before, `?Mod` and `?Meth` can be unbound variables.

- If `?Specification` is of the form `?[|?Meth->?]@?Mod` then only the consistency between `->` and `=>` is checked and only for frames that are statements about classes as a whole, i.e., the frame formulas of the form `?[|?Meth->?]@?Mod` and `?[|?Meth=>?]@?Mod`. The `obj[...]-style frames are ignored. Missing types (semistructured data) are flagged.

- If `?Specification` is of the form `?[|?Meth=>?]@?Mod` then again only the consistency between `?[|?Meth->?]@?Mod` and `?[|?Meth=>?]@?Mod` is checked, but missing types are not flagged.

For example, if our knowledge base consists of:

```
a[b->c].
a[b=d].
c:d.
```

then the query will fail, as the typing is correct:

?- Type[check(?[?Meth->?],?Result)]@\typecheck.

But if, in addition, we had

```
a[b=e].
a[foo->e].
```
then the above query would yield multiple evidences of type inconsistency:

\[ \text{Result} = \{ \{ \{ a[b \to e] \}, \{ a[b \Rightarrow d] \} \}, \{ a[foo \to e] \} \} \]

The first item in the list (the pair inside parentheses) means that the frame \( a[b \to e] \) violates the type constraint specified by the signature \( a[b \Rightarrow d] \). The second item means that the frame \( a[foo \to e] \) does not have a corresponding signature. On the other hand,

\[ \text{- Type[check}(?[?Meth=>?],\text{Result})]\@\text{typecheck}. \]

will yield only the first evidence because \( a[foo\to e] \) does not violate any typing constraint for semistructured data.

If the object position in the first argument of \text{check} is bound then this object is treated as a class and only the objects in that class will be type-checked. For instance, if we also had

\begin{verbatim}
q[foo->bar].
q:qq.
\end{verbatim}

in our knowledge base then the query

\[ \text{- Type[check(qq[?Meth=>?],\text{Result})]\@\text{typecheck}.} \]

will return one evidence of type inconsistency:

\[ \text{Result} = \{ \{ q[foo \to bar] \} \} \]

because \( q \) is the only object in class \( qq \) that has type violations.

An easy way to remember which type of constraint represents what kind of type checking is to think that \( \Rightarrow \) represents typing and, therefore the \( \Rightarrow \)-style constraints mean that only the methods that have typing information will be type-checked. The \( \rightarrow \)-style constraints, on the other hand, mean that all methods will be checked—whether they have signatures or not. Similarly, \( \ldots[1\ldots1] \)-style constraints indicate that only information about classes as a whole will be type-checked, while information specified explicitly for individual objects will not be. In contrast, \( \ldots[\ldots] \)-style constraints indicate that all type information will be verified.

### 45.3 Checking Cardinality of Methods

\( \mathcal{E} \text{RGO} \) does not automatically enforce the cardinality constraint specified in method signatures. However, the \text{type} system module in \( \mathcal{E} \text{RGO} \) provides methods for checking cardinality constraints for methods that have such constraints declared in their signatures.
In practice as well as in theory things are more complicated, however. First, it is theoretically impossible to have a terminating query that will flag a violation of a cardinality constraint if and only if one exists.

In practice, the constraint checking methods in the type system library may trigger run-time errors if there are rules that use non-logical features or certain built-ins in their bodies. Therefore, in practice, the user should do constraint-checking methods only for purely logical methods. Cardinality constraints declared for methods that are defined with the help of non-logical features should be used for documentation only.

The above problems aside, in ERGO it is easy to verify that a particular method satisfies a cardinality constraint. For instance, if method foo is declared as

```
someclass[|foo {2..3}=> sometype|].
```

then to check that the cardinality constraint is not violated, one can ask the following query:

```
?- Cardinality[check(?Obj[foo =>?])]
```

If no violations are found, the above query will fail. If there are violations of this constraint then ?Obj will get bound to the objects for which the violation was detected. For instance, consider the following knowledge base:

```
c1[|foo {2..3}=> int|].
c::c.
o1:c.
o2:c.
o3:c.
o1[foo->{1,2,3,4}].
o3[foo->{3,4}].
c[|foo -> 2|].
c1[|foo -> {3,4,5}|].
```

Then the query

```
?- Cardinality[check(?O[foo=>?])]
```

will return ?O = o1 and ?O = o2 because o1 has a method foo with four values while at most 3 are allowed according to the signature. The object o2 is returned because foo has no values for
that object, while at least 2 are required. The object o3 is not returned because it does not violate the constraint. Similarly, the query

?- Cardinality[check(?O[foo=>?|])]

will return ?O = c because the method foo has only 1 value for that class, while at least two are required by the signature. The class c1 is not returned because it does not violate the constraint.

In general, the allowed forms of the method check in class Cardinality are as follows. The argument is always an atomic signature frame (no need to specify reification $\{\ldots\}$). The method type of the signature can be only =>, but the frames can have the \ldots\-style or \ldots|[\ldots]|-style. The former checks the cardinality constraints of object methods, while the latter checks cardinality constraints only for default values of the methods.

- **Cardinality[check(?Object[?Method => ?])]**
  Checks cardinality constraints for ?Method of type => in the current module. That is, whether there are instances of the literal ?Object[?Method -> ?Val] that violate a cardinality constraint imposed by some signature of the form ?Object[?Method{?Low..?High}=>?Type] (which may be a derived signature).

- **Cardinality[check(?Obj[?Method => ?]|?Module)]**
  Checks cardinality constraints for the default values of ?Method in module ?Module. If ?Module is unbound and a cardinality constraint violation is detected in some module then ?Module is bound to that module. That is, it is a check for whether there are instances of the literal ?Object[|?Method -> ?Val|] that violate a cardinality constraint imposed by some signature of the form ?Object[|?Method{?Low..?High}=>?Type|] (which may be a derived signature).

- **Cardinality[check(?Obj[?Method {?LoBound..?HiBound} => ?]|?Mod)]**
  Like the previous query, but the variables ?LoBound and ?HiBound, which must be unbound variables, can be used to indicate which bounds are violated. If the lower bound is violated, then ?LoBound will be bound to the violated lower bound; otherwise, it is bound to ok. If the higher bound is violated, then ?HiBound is bound to the violated higher bound; otherwise it is bound to ok.

  If ?Mod is unbound then it will be bound to the module(s) in which the cardinality constraint is violated.

For instance, for the above knowledge base, the query

?- Cardinality[check(?O[foo {?Low..?High} => ?]|?Module)]
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will bind \(?O\) to c, \(?\text{Mod}\) to main, \(?\text{Low}\) to 2, and \(?\text{High}\) to ok. Indeed, only the lower bound of the cardinality constraint \(c[\{\text{foo} \{2..3}\} \Rightarrow \text{int}]\) (which was inherited from cl) is violated by the class c.

\[- \text{Cardinality}[\text{check}(\text{\?O}[\text{foo} \{\text{Low}..\text{High}\} \Rightarrow \text{?}]])@\text{typecheck}.\]

will return the following results:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{\?O} &= \text{o1} \\
\text{\?Low} &= \text{ok} \\
\text{\?High} &= 3 \\
\text{\?O} &= \text{o2} \\
\text{\?Low} &= 2 \\
\text{\?High} &= \text{ok}
\end{align*}
\]

45.4 Logical Assertions that Depend on Transactional and Non-logical Features

On page 150 we mentioned the potential problems when tabled predicates or frames depend on updates. A similar problem arises when such statements depend on non-logical features, such as \texttt{var(...)}) or on statements that have side effects, such as I/O operations (e.g., \texttt{write(’foo bar’)}@\texttt{prolog}). Since tabled statements in E\textsc{rgo} are considered purely logical, one cannot assume that the evaluation happens in the same way as in Prolog. For instance, consider the following knowledge base:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{\?O[bar]} & \ :- \ \text{\?O:foo}. \\
\text{\?O:foo} & \ :- \ \text{writeln(’executed’)}@\text{prolog}. \\
\text{- \ abc[bar]}. \\
\end{align*}
\]

Despite what one might expect, the above query will cause “executed” to be printed twice — once when \texttt{abc[bar]} will be proved for the first time and once when the system will attempt some other way of proving \texttt{abc[bar]}. (The system may not realize that the second proof is not necessary.) In general, transactional and side-effectfull statements might be executed even if the attempt to prove the statement in the rule head ultimately fails.

\textsc{ergo} issues warnings when it finds that a tabled predicate depends on non-logical or side-effectfull statements, but it does not warn about all Prolog predicates of this kind. Therefore, caution needs to be exercised in specifying purely logical statements and warnings should not be ignored. If you are certain that a particular suspicious dependency is harmless, use the \texttt{ignore\_depchk} directive to suppress the warning.
45.5 Examining Tables

Sometimes it is useful to be able to examine the tables that XSB has generated while answering queries. To this end, ERGO provides the following library predicates:

\tabledump(File,AtomicGoal)
\tabledump(File,AtomicGoal,Option)

The File argument specifies the file in which to place the results. The results are in the ERGO format, as explained below. If File is userout then the results go to the standard output. AtomicGoal is a HiLog predicate or an atomic frame (e.g., ?[?->foo]). It specifies the subgoals for which tables are being requested. Option is the option selected. Currently three options are supported: summary (minimalist output that summarizes the overall statistics of tables), subgoals (more details about individual subgoals). The third option, answers, will output full details, including the information about each called subgoal and all answers to all subgoals.

The first (binary) form of \tabledump above is equivalent to \tabledump(File,AtomicGoal,summary).

In all three cases, \tabledump generates information about the tables for subgoals that are subsumed by AtomicGoal. If AtomicGoal is a variable, information is displayed about all tables.

When the summary option is used, the information is displayed in the following format:

AtomicGoal[total_subgoals->..., total_subgoal_answers->...].

For instance,

?- \tabledump(userout,?).

${?A(?B)}[total_subgoals->1, total_subgoal_answers->0].
${?A(?B,?C)}[total_subgoals->3, total_subgoal_answers->2].

?- \tabledump(userout,p(2,?)).

${p(2,?A)}[total_subgoals->1, total_subgoal_answers->1].

If the third option is used (answers), then in addition to the output produced for the summary option the system will show the individual subgoals subsumed by AtomicGoal and the answers to each:

AtomicGoal[
total_subgoals->1,
subgoal_details->{Subgoal1[total_answers->..., answer_list->[answer1,...],
Subgoal2[total_answers->..., answer_list->[answer2,...],
...]}.

For instance, the following might be produced for the two earlier requests, if the details option is specified:

?- \tabledump(userout,?,answers).

${?A(?B)}[total_subgoals->1, total_subgoal_answers->0].
${?A(?B)}[total_subgoals->1,
subgoal_details->{${q(?_h34)}[total_answers->0, answer_list->[]]}].
${?A(?B,?C)}[total_subgoals->3, total_subgoal_answers->2].
${?A(?B,?C)}[total_subgoals->3,
subgoal_details->{${p(2,b)}[total_answers->1, answer_list->[${p(2,b)}]},
${p(1,a)}[total_answers->1, answer_list->[${p(1,a)}]},
${p(?_h65,?_h67)}[total_answers->0, answer_list->[]]}].

?- \tabledump(userout,p(2,?),answers).

${p(2,?A)}[total_subgoals->1, total_subgoal_answers->0].
${p(2,?A)}[total_subgoals->1,
subgoal_details->{${p(2,b)}[total_answers->1, answer_list->[${p(2,b)}]}].

If the second option is used (subgoals), then the output is similar to the third option, but the answer_list part is not shown. In this case, the output is slightly smaller. However, it should be kept in mind that for large knowledge bases with large numbers of answers table dumps can be huge (hundreds of megabytes) and it can take considerable time to dump these tables. In this case only the first option (and maybe the second, if you must) is recommended.

### 45.6 Examining Incomplete Tables

Sometimes it becomes necessary to examine incomplete tables (i.e., tables to subgoals that have not yet been completely evaluated) in the middle of execution or upon exception.

To get a dump of all incomplete tables in the middle of the computation, one has to insert the predicate `\dump_incomplete_tables` in an appropriate place in user’s rule bodies. For instance,
r(0,?):- !, \dump_incomplete_tables(temp).
r(3,?A):- r(5,?A).
r(?N,?A):- ?N1 is ?N - 1, r(?N1,?A).
?- r(5,foo(a)).

will put the following into the file temp:

$\{r(5,\text{foo}(a))\}[\text{scc->1}].$
$\{r(4,\text{foo}(a))\}[\text{scc->1}].$
$\{r(3,\text{foo}(a))\}[\text{scc->1}].$
$\{r(2,\text{foo}(a))\}[\text{scc->2}].$
$\{r(1,\text{foo}(a))\}[\text{scc->3}].$
$\{r(0,\text{foo}(a))\}[\text{scc->4}].$

It says that there are four strongly connected components of subgoals, numbered 1, 2, 3, and 4. All of these subgoals are still waiting to be fully computed, but at the moment their truth values are still unknown.

More often, though, one might need to examine incomplete tables after an exception, if the user suspects that the exception has something to do with tabled subgoals. Such a table dump looks exactly like the dump produced by \dump_incomplete_tables/1 but it is requested differently. First, one must execute the query

?- \set_dump_incomplete_tables_on_exception.

Then, after an exception took place, the user should execute the query

?- \dump_incomplete_tables_after_exception(filename).

For instance,

?- \set_dump_incomplete_tables_on_exception.
q(0,?):- !, abort@\sys.
q(3,?A):- q(5,?A).
q(?N,?A):- ?N1 is ?N - 1,q(?N1,?A).
?- q(5,foo(a)).
?- \dump_incomplete_tables_after_exception(temp).

The dump of the tables that were incomplete at the time of the abort will be in the file temp and will have the same structure as before:
$\{q(5,\text{foo}(a))\}[\text{scc}\rightarrow 1]$
$\{q(4,\text{foo}(a))\}[\text{scc}\rightarrow 1]$
$\{q(3,\text{foo}(a))\}[\text{scc}\rightarrow 1]$
$\{q(2,\text{foo}(a))\}[\text{scc}\rightarrow 2]$
$\{q(1,\text{foo}(a))\}[\text{scc}\rightarrow 3]$
$\{q(0,\text{foo}(a))\}[\text{scc}\rightarrow 4]$

\text{\textsc{Ergo}}, in addition, has a much more useful primitive, \texttt{showgoals\ldots}, which can show the information about incomplete computations without the need to modify the program rules and in a more focused way.

### 45.7 Non-termination Analysis

It is a fact of life that an \textsc{Ergo} query might not terminate. In fact, due to the expressive power of \textsc{Ergo}, it is \textit{undecidable} whether a query will terminate or not. However, \textsc{Ergo} comes with a powerful analysis tool called \textit{Terminyzer} (for non-Termination Analyzer), which can greatly help in determining whether a given query might not terminate.

Terminyzer examines the trace of the query run and tries to detect symptoms of non-termination. Since the problem is fundamentally undecidable, it may not find any problems even if they exist and it may report a non-terminating loop falsely. In some cases, the analysis might turn out to be too time consuming and thus not feasible. Details of the approach are given in \cite{10, 11}. It is guaranteed that Terminyzer will find a problematic loop \textit{given enough time}. But the time we have is limited and it is pointless to wait beyond 10 or 15 minutes. When Terminyzer reports a loop, however, it means that the query will indeed not terminate or it might terminate after a very long period of time and the reported loop may be a computational bottleneck. It is worth to examine the reported loop and see if you can spot any inefficiency or redundancy.

Non-termination can happen due to two reasons:

- the execution might be invoking some subgoals repeatedly, with larger and larger arguments; or
- some subgoal has an infinite number of answers.

Here is a typical example of a non-terminating query due to the first reason:

```
p(a).
q(b).
p(?X) :- q(f1(?X)).
q(?X) :- p(f2(?X)).
?- p(?X).
```
Clearly, the two rules on lines 3 and 4 repeatedly call each other with increasingly growing arguments $f_1(...), f_1(f_2(...), f_1(f_2(f_1(...)))$ etc., and Terminyzer will dutifully report the following:

*** Report: subgoals that form a possibly infinite call loop ***

- $p(f_2(f_1(f_2(f_1(?A))))))$ in rule on line 4, file test1.ergo, module main
- $q(f_1(f_2(f_1(f_2(f_1(?A))))))$ in rule on line 3, file test1.ergo, module main

The user can then examine the reported subgoals in the rules that occur at the specified lines and will easily see the problem. In general, several subgoals in several rules can be involved, and the larger the cycle the harder it is to understand what is going on. However, this is certainly much easier than manually finding and examining a sometimes astronomical number of possible loops in a knowledge base that has a few dozens to thousands of rules.

If the cause of non-termination is due to repeated calls to the same subgoals with increasingly large arguments, a simple remedy may sometimes help; it is called call abstraction and can be requested using the setruntime directive described in Section 45.11.2. Call abstraction is a technique that the underlying XSB inference engine can use to prevent calls with increasingly deeply nested arguments by replacing deeply nested subterms with variables. In our example, subgoal abstraction at term size 5 will take the call such as

$$p(f_1(f_2(f_1(f_2(f_1(?X)))))$$

and transform it into an equivalent call

$$p(f_1(f_2(f_1(?Y))), ?Y = f_2(f_1(?X))$$

The effect is that the new call has no more than 5 symbols and the first cause of non-termination is impossible. In our case, issuing the command

?- setruntime{goalsize(5,abstract)}.

prior to running the query $p(?X)$ would terminate the query with the answer

?X = a

Call abstraction is no a panacea, however. In some cases, it may transform a non-terminating program with an infinite loop of subgoal calls into a non-terminating program in which some subgoal has an infinite number of answers. That is, the first cause of non-termination will morph
into the second. To see if call abstraction might help your query, check the box “Abstract large subgoals?” when you start Terminyzer (which is in the sequel).

If the cause of non-termination is an infinite number of answers to some subgoal or a set of subgoals, Terminyzer will try to identify such subgoals. To illustrate, consider the following knowledge base and a query:

```
p(a).
q(b).
p(f1(?X)) :- q(?X).
q(f2(?X)) :- p(?X).
?- p(?X).
```

This is similar to the previous query, but the function symbols are in the rule heads. It is easy to see that the query has the answers \( p(f1(a)) \), \( p(f1(f2(f1(a)))) \), \( p(f1(f2(f1(f2(f1(a)))))) \), etc., ad infinity. In this case, Terminyzer will report

*** Report: subgoals that form a possibly infinite answer-producing pattern ***

- \( q(?A) \) in rule on line 3, file test2.ergo, module main
- \( p(?A) \) in rule on line 4, file test2.ergo, module main

What this means is that answers to the subgoal \( q(?A) \) that feeds into the rule on line 3 might cause production of new answers for the head \( p(\ldots) \). But the next line in the report says that production of new answers for \( p(\ldots) \) might cause production of new answers for \( q(\ldots) \) because \( p(\ldots) \) feeds its answers into the rule on line 4, which generates answers for its head \( q(\ldots) \).

In the rare case when you find that the knowledge base is correct and the infinite set of answers is inevitable, the computation will not terminate and one will not get any answers. However, not everything is lost. The engine also supports answer abstraction — a technique similar to call abstraction. Since we cannot cheat the nature, something will have to give, and what we have to give is precision. Executing both of these commands (where the sizes are chosen for the sake of an example):

```
?- setruntime{goalsize(7,abstract)},
    setruntime{answersize(3,abstract)}.
```

will give the following answers:

```
?X = a
```
what this means is that we got four certain answers and the instances of the fifth answer are undefined. This is because some of them are true answers and some are not.

Answer abstraction together with call abstraction is guaranteed to terminate any query that has the following properties:

- uses only tabled (non-transactional predicates and methods)
- does not use arithmetic operators
- does not perform updates of any kind.

To see how Terminyzer works in practice, start ERGO and load the knowledge base. Then type `terminyzer{}` at the command prompt or select “Use Terminyzer” from the Debug menu, if using the Studio.

If the monitor has graphical capabilities, a window will pop up with suggested values of various “tripwires.” A tripwire is a condition that will cause XSB to pause if certain events happen. Terminyzer uses the following tripwires:

- **timer:** the query computation will pause if a timeout occurs
- **goal size limit:** if the computation generates a subgoal of the size exceeding the specified number, the computation will pause; the Terminyzer window also lets the user check a box to request that call abstraction should be used.
- **answer size limit:** the computation will pause if a subgoal answer gets generated that exceeds the given limit.
- **limit on the number of currently unfinished subgoals:** the computation reaches the state where the number of unfinished subgoals (that it is still trying to evaluate) exceeds the given limit.

When the computation pauses, various messages will be printed for your perusal and Terminyzer will start its analysis. When it is done, a window will pop up telling you the results. It may find the problem on the first try and you should then try to find the problem in the knowledge base.
based on Terminyzer’s report. It is also possible that no problems were found. In that case, you might want to ask Terminyzer to try harder.

When Terminyzer finishes its analysis, it asks the user whether to continue the analysis further or to stop. If you would like to continue, respond appropriately and the analysis will continue after you resume the query. (The query is not resumed by itself, giving the user an opportunity to change mind or to examine the reported statistics and to use other tools.) When the query is resumed, the computation will pause again if any of the tripwires is tripped. Note that if the pause happened due to the times then the timer is reset to the same value as before. If the pause was due to any other reason, say, reaching the goal size limit, that limit is automatically increased by 20%. (Any other tripwire limit is not affected unless the computation pauses due to that tripwire.)

Note that with each new pause the time it takes to analyze the computation increases, since Terminyzer now tries to look at a bigger chunk of the computation trace. It does try to give the user an idea about how long the wait might be, but it is only a very rough figure.

Finally, if you decide to stop Terminyzer, this does not stop the query. You can still resume it, use other analysis tools, or you can abort it.

### 45.8 Runtime Inspection of Computation

ERGO allows the user to stop any computation by hitting `Ctrl-C` in the terminal or by clicking the `Pause` button in the ERGO listener. During the pause, one can ask certain queries about the state of the computation, but not arbitrary queries. Specifically, no tabled (non-transactional) queries are allowed and insert/delete operations are not permitted either. The most useful queries that one can ask are described below.

The `showgoals{...}` command to display information about the goals still being computed. The information shown is the number of answers for each goal computed so far and the number of calls to each goal. The output is sorted first by the number of answers and then by the number of calls. There are two types of the `showgoals` command:

- **showgoals{}**: this shows all incomplete subgoals that have over 1000 calls or over 50 answers.
- **showgoals{CallCutoff,AnswerCutoff}**: This will show only the subgoals that have more than `CallCutoff` calls or over `AnswerCutoff` answers.

ERGO also provides a companion primitive, `showtables{...}`, which is usually more convenient than the table dump because it provides a more focused output and is easier to use. This primitive is intended not for the pause in computation but for analysis to be performed after a query of interest is finished. It then displays subgoals that took part in the computation of the last (and
previous queries) using the same format as \texttt{showgoals\{\ldots\}}. There are two types of the \texttt{showtables} command:

- \texttt{showtables\{\}}: this shows all incomplete subgoals that have over 1000 calls or over 50 answers.
- \texttt{showtables\{CallCutoff,AnswerCutoff\}}: This will show only the subgoals that have over \texttt{CallCutoff} calls or more than \texttt{AnswerCutoff} answers.

The \texttt{showgoals\{\ldots\}} primitive is typically used to investigate reasons for \textit{runaway} computation, i.e., non-termination of queries as well as diagnose performance problems. It is designed to be used during pauses in query computation, before the query finishes. The \texttt{showtables\{\ldots\}} primitive is designed to be used after the query finishes and thus is useful only for analyzing the performance aspect of runaway computations. The call and answer cutoffs must be chosen judiciously. In both of the above runaway cases, the goals of interest are those that either have many calls to them (in the thousands, but depends on the case at hand) or have many answers (in the tens or hundreds, as appropriate). Examining the information provided by \texttt{ERGO} during pauses and after query completion can provide a number of insights:

- \textit{Compare the number of active goals and the number of active recursive components}, which is shown when the computation is paused. The active goals/components are the ones that are currently being computed and therefore are of interest during pauses in the computation.
  
  - Check the \textit{ratio} of the \textit{number of active recursive components to the number of active goals}. This ration is normally $\leq 1$, but if it is very small (say, under 3% and keeps falling during subsequent pauses), then it is an indication that the rules are poorly structured. Every subgoal depends on many other subgoals and there likely are too many calls that do not contribute to the query results, but just waste the computational resources. Consider restructuring the rules so that the recursive components form some kind of a hierarchy. The use of \texttt{ERGO} modules is strongly recommended in this case. Also, try to mix HiLog and frame-based representation.
  
  - If the aforesaid ratio stays approximately constant and \textit{both} the number of active recursive components and the number of active goals climb steadily, it is an indication of an infinite recursion where subgoals are called with increasingly deeply nested terms (e.g., $p(f(a))$, $p(f(f(a)))$, $p(f(f(f(a))))$, etc.). The aforesaid ratio in such cases is typically non-negligible ($> 0.3$).

- \textit{Check the memory usage}, which is shown during each pause. If memory usage keeps climbing steadily, it might indicate a runaway computation or a possible scalability problem.

- \textit{Watch the cpu time} shown during each pause. It can be helpful as a way of tracking progress. This is cpu time since the time \texttt{ERGO} started; it includes all the pauses.
• Check the number of derived facts shown at each pause. If this number does not grow and ERGO keeps going on and on, it is an indication of some kind of a runaway computation.

• Use showgoals during the computation pauses. As mentioned earlier, you will likely be interested in goals with many calls or many answers. Keep increasing the cutoffs during subsequent pauses. Examining the active goals can indicate two things:
  – Weird, unexpected stuff showing up as active goals might provide a hint about a possible bug in the user’s rules.
  – Some goals have unusually high numbers or calls and/or answers. This may mean two things:
    * Non-terminating computation. The goals in question might be involved in a non-terminating recursive loop. Terminezr (Section 45.7) may supply additional information if this is the case, including the information about the rules that are involved in such a loop.
    * Gross inefficiency. The computation may be terminating but, for some reason, the goals in question get called unusually often or they produce too many results. The latter might also indicate a bug.

• Use showtables after the computation. This is used after and if the query finishes. In that case, the query obviously terminates, but one might be still dissatisfied with the performance. The showtables primitive supplies the same kind of information as showgoals, but since the former is called after the query is done, it supplies complete information about the subgoals that took part in the computation. This can give too kinds of hints: a possible bug or a possible inefficiency. As before, a bug may be lurking if unexpected subgoals show up in the output of showtables. Inefficiency should be suspected if some subgoals have unusually high number of calls and/or answers.

The table dump described in Section 45.5 provides much additional information, but examining it manually is usually overwhelming. The table dump feature is designed for expert users who know how to write Prolog and/or ERGO programs to analyze such dumps automatically and check the various hypotheses about the computational behavior of queries.

Another very useful informational primitive that is allowed during pauses is peek\(\{\text{query}\}\), where query is an atomic subgoal (tabled, non-transactional). It examines the current state of the computation of query and reports the answers that have been computed so far. This primitive is described in more detail in Section 24.3.
45.9 Continuous Runtime Monitoring

Sometimes, especially when queries take a long time, it might be useful to see the various statistics pertaining to the queries. To request this service, the user can execute the following command in the ERGO shell:

\[ \text{ergo}\$> \text{setmonitor}\{\text{Secs}, \text{Type}\}. \]

The effect will be that all subsequent queries will be monitored and every \( \text{Secs} \) seconds certain statistics will be printed out to the standard output. Here \( \text{Type} \) is the type of the monitor. The heartbeat monitor just shows the elapsed time. The performance monitor shows time, memory, and other key statistics. The extended monitor shows additional statistics of interest.

\( \text{Secs} \) must be a non-negative integer. If \( \text{Secs} = 0 \), monitoring is turned off. Note: it is not guaranteed that the statistics will be refreshed every \( \text{Secs} \) seconds, as certain intermediate computations are not interruptable and may take several seconds. In such cases, the next statistics report would be output right after such a non-interruptable computation ends.

If the user instead types

\[ \text{ergo}\$> \text{setmonitor}\{} \]

then the parameters can be input via a dialog window, which will pop up.

If ERGO is run under the studio or in a graphical desktop environment out of a command line window, the output from the monitor will go into a separate pop-up window. Otherwise, it will be redirected to the standard output (which might interfere with the output of the query if the query has write-statements of its own; this does not interfere with the display of the query results however).

Some of the statistics shown by the performance and heartbeat monitors are described in Section 45.8 on runtime inspection of computation and they thus provide indication of the state of the system as described there.

45.10 Tracing Tabled Calls via Forest Logging

While the regular Call-Redo-Exit-Fail logging is useful in many cases, it is extremely slow and generates large amounts of output. A query that runs mere 10 seconds can take hours to execute under tracing and it may generate hundreds of megabytes worth of trace output. Clearly, it is hard to use the regular tracing facility under such conditions. On top of this, even though the regular trace is capable of producing queriable output, such trace does not supply parent-child relationships between calls, and, due to this, automatic analysis of such trace is very hard.
Fortunately, there is an alternative: forest logging. Forest logging is a kind of tracing that keeps track only of tabled predicate calls. It is very fast (time overhead is less than 80% compared to orders of magnitude for the regular trace), it generates drastically smaller trace logs, and it preserves the parent-child relationship between the calls. The drawback is that logforest traces track tabled calls only, but in ERGO this is not a serious problem since most calls that are of interest to the user are tabled (except for transactional predicates and methods).

ERGO’s forest logging is implemented as a presentation layer on top of XSB’s forest logging. Its format and other details are described next.

**Forest logging.** To start forest logging, the user must issue the command `\logforest` at the ERGO prompt or include the query `?- \logforest` where appropriate. In the latter case, logging will start after this subgoal gets executed. To stop forest logging, issue the command `\nologforest`.

The entries in the log represent the following actions that occur during tabled evaluation of queries and every entry has an Id which is a non-negative integer.

- **A call to a tabled subgoal.** When a call to a tabled subgoal $S_1$ is made from a derivation tree for $S_2$, a frame literal is recorded in the following format:
  
  \[
  \text{call(Id)[goal->S1, stage->Stage, parent->S2]}
  \]

  where Id is the generated Id of the call and Stage is
  - new if $S_1$ is a new subgoal.
  - comp if $S_1$ is an old completed subgoal.
  - incmp if $S_1$ is an old incomplete subgoal (i.e., it has not been fully evaluated yet).

  If $S_1$ is the first tabled subgoal in an evaluation, $S_2$ is represented by the atom null. If the call is negative, a similar fact of the form `negative_call(Id)[goal->S1, stage->Stage, parent->S2]` is logged.

- **Derivation of a new answer.** When a new unconditional answer $A$ is derived for subgoal $S$ and added to the table, the following fact is logged:
  
  \[
  \text{answer(Id)[goal->S, answer->A]}
  \]

  As before, Id is the identity number generated for this particular action.

  When a new conditional answer $A$ is derived for subgoal $S$ and the delayed literals are $D$, a log of the form `conditional_answer(Id)[goal->S, answer->A, delayed_literals->D]` is recorded.
• **Return of an answer to a consuming subgoal.** When an answer $A$ is computed and returned to a consumer subgoal $S$ in a derivation tree for $ST$ and the table for $S$ is incomplete, the following fact is recorded:

\[
\text{answer_to_consumer}(Id)[\text{goal} \rightarrow S, \text{answer} \rightarrow A, \text{consumer} \rightarrow ST].
\]

If $A$ is conditional, this entry \(\text{delayed_answer_to_consumer}(Id)[\text{goal} \rightarrow S, \text{answer} \rightarrow A, \text{consumer} \rightarrow ST]\) is recorded.

• **Delaying a negative literal.** When a selected negative literal $N$ of a node $S$ is delayed due to its involvement in a loop through negation, and $S$ is in a derivation tree for $ST$, a fact of this form is logged:

\[
\text{delay}(Id)[\text{delayed_literal} \rightarrow N, \text{parent} \rightarrow ST].
\]

• **Subgoal completion.** When a set $S$ of subgoals is completely evaluated, for each $S \in S$ a fact of the following format is logged for each $S$:

\[
\text{completed}(Id)[\text{goal} \rightarrow S, \text{sccnum} \rightarrow \text{SCCNum}].
\]

Here SCCNum is the identifier generated for the set of subgoals $S$. If $S$ is completed early, SCCNum is the atom ec.

• **Table abolishes.** There are three occasions where tables are abolished.
  – When a tabled subgoal $S$ is abolished, a fact of the following form is logged:

\[
\text{table_abolished}(Id)[\text{type} \rightarrow \text{subg}, \text{goal} \rightarrow S].
\]
  – When all tables for a predicate $p/n$ are abolished, a fact of the following form is logged:

\[
\text{table_abolished}(Id)[\text{type} \rightarrow \text{pred}, \text{goal} \rightarrow [p/n]].
\]
  – When all tables are abolished, the following fact is logged:

\[
\text{table_abolished}(Id)[\text{type} \rightarrow \text{all}].
\]

• **Recording of errors.** If an error is thrown and the execution is in a derivation tree for subgoal $S$, forest logging records the following fact:

\[
\text{error}(Id)[\text{goal} \rightarrow S].
\]

By default, logs are sent to the current output stream. However, it is usually more convenient to dump the logs to a file using the following command: `\logforest(File)`. For instance, executing
will direct ERGO to dump the entire forest log into the file `foobar.ergo`. In case the user also wants to examine the original XSB’s forest logging trace, the following command can be executed: `\logforest(FloraTraceFile,XSBTraceFile)`. For instance, executing

```prolog
?- \logforest('foobar.ergo', 'foobar.P').
```

will dump the trace in the above ERGO format into the file `foobar.ergo` and keep the original XSB’s forest log in the file `foobar.P`.

We may want to skip certain types of log entries in some circumstances such as reducing log file sizes. ERGO provides `\logforest(HideOptions)` and `\logforest(File, HideOptions)`, where `HideOptions` is a list of log types to be skipped. The elements of `HideOptions` can be one of the following: `call`, `negative_call`, `delayed_call`, `answer`, `conditional_answer`, `answer_to_consumer`, `delayed_answer_to_consumer`, `completed`, `table_abolished`, and `error`. For instance,

```prolog
?- \logforest([table_abolished, error]).
?- \logforest('foobar.ergo', [table_abolished, error]).
```

will not record logs for table abolish and error actions.

Note that `\logforest(FloraTraceFile,XSBTraceFile)` and `\logforest(File,HideOptions)` will not be mixed since ERGO checks whether their second argument is a list or not to tell which command is executed. Similarly, `\logforest(HideOptions)` and `\logforest(File)` will not be mixed.

It is important to keep in mind, however, that no output is produced (to the file or output stream) unless the user issues the command `\nologforest`. In other words, forest logging can be obtained only after the evaluation is finished. If you expect the query to throw an error, it is a good idea to use the ERGO `catch...` primitive. If the query does not terminate, you should also wrap the query with the `timed_call/3` XSB predicate.\footnote{\textit{timed_call/3} is described in the XSB Manual, Part 1. Do not forget to reify the query argument to \textit{timed_call/3}.}

**Low-level forest logging.** Sometimes it is necessary to look into the guts of forest logging without converting it into the ERGO format. Typically this is needed for low-level debugging of ERGO itself. The command for this is `\logforestlow`; it directs ERGO to display forest logs directly in the XSB format. There is also a version of this command for saving the log in a file:
?- \logforestlow('foobar.ergo').

As before, one should remember to issue the command \nologforest in order to flush the log to the output. ERGO also provides \logforestlow(HideOptions) and \logforestlow(File, HideOptions) to skip certain types of low-level log entries.

45.11 Controlling Subgoal and Answer Size, Timeouts, Unification Mode

Sometimes it is useful to be able to control the term-size of the subgoals that can be generated during evaluation and the size of the answers returned. The former is useful if the user knowledge base has recursive rules in which the size of the body literals is greater than the size of the head. The latter is useful when a query has an infinite number of answers. In both cases, limiting the size can terminate a run-away computation. Timeouts are useful when it is desirable to stop the computation if it does not finish within a preset amount of time. To control these features, ERGO provides the builtin primitive that can appear in any query or rule body:

?- setruntime{Opt1,Opt2,...}

Several options can be used in the same setruntime command. These options are described below.

45.11.1 Timeouts

The following setruntime{...} options can be used to control various types of timeouts:

\begin{align*}
\text{timeout}(Spec) \\
\text{timeout}(Spec,Spec) \\
\text{timeout}(0)
\end{align*}

where Spec is either max(Time,Handler) or repeating(Time,Handler). Here Time is a positive integer that specifies the number of seconds after which queries should be interrupted. The first form will interrupt the queries once (so this form is used to specify timeouts) and the second will interrupt queries periodically, after each Time seconds. Either max, or repeating, or both can be specified (via the 1-argument and 2-argument form of timeout). In either case, Handler will be called at each interrupt. The last form above removes all timeout restrictions. Note that each subsequent setruntime timeout-setting command will override the previous one.

Here are some examples:

?- setruntime{timeout(max(4,fail))}. 
?- setruntime{timeout(max(100,abort))}.  
?- setruntime{timeout(repeating(4,Handler(?)),max(100,abort))}.  
?- setruntime{timeout(0)}. 

Note that once any of these commands is issued, it applies to all subsequent queries. The last  
command resets the timeout to infinity.

Handler in the max and repeating specifications must have one of the following forms:

- A predefined error handler: ignore (ignore the timer interrupt), abort (abort the current  
goal), fail (make the current goal fail); or
- A Prolog predicate defined in some Prolog module; or
- A predicate declared using ERGO’s :- prolog{...} directive.
- A predefined error handler pause, which is available only in ERGO. In that case, the execution  
pauses and the user is given the opportunity to inspect the state of the system and then either  
continue or abort the computation. The pause interrupt handler is perhaps the most useful  
when the system runs in interactive mode. For instance,

  ?- setruntime{timeout(repeating(20,pause))}. 

If Handler is a Prolog predicate that exists in the default Prolog’s usermod module then the  
handler should look like foobar(?)@\prolog or foobar@\prolog (i.e., one or zero arguments).  
The argument, if present, must be an unbound variable, which will be bound at runtime to the  
goal being interrupted. A Prolog handler is specified as foobar(?)@\prolog(mod) if foobar/1 is  
in Prolog’s module mod rather than in the usermod module. In both of these cases, foobar/1 must  
be defined in a Prolog program that ERGO has already loaded. In ERGO, information primitives  
such as showgoals{}, can also be used as handlers.  

If the handler is an ERGO predicate declared as :- prolog{...} then it must be specified as  
foobar(?)@mod (note: not \prolog(mod), but mod), where mod is an ERGO module (or \@, if the  
current ERGO module is desired)—see Section 16.3.

For instance, the following fragment in ERGO sets the system for periodic timer interrupts:

  :- prolog{periodic_handler/1}.  
    periodic_handler(?
  Goal) :- writeln(interrupted_goal=?
  Goal)@\prolog.  
  ?- setruntime{timeout(repeating(2,periodic_handler(?
  Goal)@\@))}. 

\footnote{The ability to pause a computation exists only in ERGO and this is why the pause interrupt handler is available only there.}
In this example, the ERGO predicate `periodic_handler/1` will be called every two seconds.

Alternatively, one could define `periodic_handler/1` as a Prolog predicate in a .P file, e.g., `foo.P`, and then set periodic interrupts as follows:

```prolog
?- ['foo.P'].
?- setruntime{timeout(repeating(2,periodic_handler(?@\prolog)))}.
```

Care must be taken to not obliterate periodic handlers during loading. For instance, in both of the above cases `periodic_handler/1` may get erased. In case of a Prolog program (the second example), the danger is not as great: `periodic_handler/1` may get replaced only if another Prolog file gets loaded and happens to have the same predicate. A Prolog predicate may also be explicitly abolished by the user, but this is rare. In case of periodic handlers defined in ERGO modules, however, the problem occur more frequently. For instance, the first example may be loaded into some module, `foo`, and then, due to an oversight, something else may get loaded (as opposed to “added”) into the same module. In that case, `periodic_handler/1` will be obliterated and the periodic timer interrupt specification will become orphaned, resulting in a runtime error. If this happens, errors will be issued whenever the interrupt handler is called.

**45.11.2 Subgoal Size Control**

The following options provide subgoal size control:

```
goalsize(TermSize,abort)
goalsize(TermSize,abstract)
goalsize(TermSize,pause) // Ergo only
```

These options control the maximum size of the subgoals called during the evaluation. `TermSize` specifies the max size of the terms returned as answers. This takes into account both nesting of all function symbols except lists (lists are considered to be of size 1) and the arity (width) of the terms.

The first form of the above options will abort the query if the specified limit is reached. The second form will perform call abstraction and replace the deeply nested subterms with new variables. The `pause`-action will pause the computation and allow the user to examine the state of the computation before deciding what to do next. Examples:

```prolog
?- setruntime{goalsize(100,abort)}.  % Examples:
?- setruntime{goalsize(100,abstract)}.
```

The above options are incompatible, so each subsequent option overrides the previous one.
45.11.3 Answer Size Control

The following options enable answer size control:

\[ \text{answersize}(\text{TermSize}, \text{abort}) \]
\[ \text{answersize}(\text{TermSize}, \text{abstract}) \]
\[ \text{answersize}(\text{TermSize}, \text{pause}) \quad \text{// Ergo only} \]

The meaning of the \text{abort} options is the same as for the goal size. The meaning of the \text{abstract} options is that the size of terms is limited to the specified numbers. If higher size answer-objects are generated, their truth value is set to \text{undefined}. This is called \text{answer abstraction}. For instance, if the computation generates the answers \( p(f(a)), p(f(f(a))), \) etc., then answer abstraction at size 5 will generate the answers up to \( p(f(f(f(a)))) \) and the last answer, \( p(f(f(f(f(?))))) \), will be \text{undefined}. This means that some of the instances of that last answer might be true and some false.

Examples:

?- setruntime{answersize(100,abort)}.
?- setruntime{answersize(100,abstract)}.

45.11.4 Controlling the Number of Active Goals

The following options enable one to control the number of active (i.e., not completely evaluated) tabled subgoals during query evaluation, which is useful for termination and performance analysis.

\[ \text{activegoals}(\text{TermSize}, \text{abort}) \]
\[ \text{activegoals}(\text{TermSize}, \text{pause}) \quad \text{// Ergo only} \]

The meaning of the \text{abort} and \text{pause} actions is the same as in the case of subgoal and answer size controls.

45.11.5 Memory Usage Limit

The following option is available:

\[ \text{memory}(\text{memory-limit-in-GBs}) \]

For instance,
?- setruntime{memory(12)}.

will set the limit to 12 GBs. If the \textsc{Ergo} process exceeds this amount, the computation will be aborted.

\textsc{Ergo} (but not \textsc{flora-2}) also supports the following:

\texttt{memory(memory-limit-in-GBs, \textit{Action})}

where \textit{Action} is either \texttt{abort} or \texttt{pause}. The \texttt{abort} option works exactly like \texttt{memory(Size)}, while if \texttt{pause} is given then the computation will pause instead of aborting. The user can then ask informational queries about the system state and decide what to do. For instance, one may decide whether to abort or to increase the memory limit and continue.

45.11.6 Unification Mode

The default unification mode in \textsc{Ergo} is unsound, in general. That is, non-unifiable terms might be unified, as explained below. The following runtime options can be used to change the unification mode:

\begin{verbatim}
unification(fast)
unification(pedantic)
\end{verbatim}

For instance,

?- setruntime{unification(fast)}.
?- setruntime{unification(pedantic)}.

These commands controls the experimental feature of unification mode. The default unification mode is \texttt{fast}. This is a logically unsound mode: it does not do the occurs-check and so the unification \( ?X = f(?X) \) will succeed even though the two terms are not unifiable in the classical sense. Under the \texttt{pedantic} mode, such a unification would fail.

Unifying in the fast mode can lead to hard-to-find errors, although \textsc{Ergo} makes attempts to limit the damage and the probability of serious problems occurring due to this mode of unification is low.

46 Considerations for Improving Performance of Queries

\textbf{Left-to-right processing}. The first rule in improving the performance of \textsc{Ergo} queries is to remember that query evaluation proceeds from left to right. Therefore it is generally advisable to
place subgoals with smaller answer sets as close to the left of the rule body as possible. And, as with databases, Cartesian products should be avoided at all costs.

**Nested frames and path expressions.** The \( \mathcal{E} \text{RGO} \) compiler makes decisions about where to place the various parts of complex frames, and the knowledge engineer can affect this placement by writing frames in various ways. For instance,

\[
?- \ldots, \ ?X[\text{attr1} -> \ ?Y, \ \text{attr2} -> \ ?Y], \ldots
\]

is translated as

\[
?- \ldots, \ ?X[\text{attr1} -> \ ?Y], \ ?X[\text{attr2} -> \ ?Y], \ldots
\]

so the first attribute will be computed first. If the second attribute has a smaller answer set, the attributes in the frame should be written in the opposite order. The other consideration has to do with literals that have nested frames in them. For instance, the following query

\[
?- \ldots, \ ?X[\text{attr1}->\?Y[\text{attr2}->\?Z]], \ f(\text{?P.attr3}), \ldots
\]

is translated as

\[
?- \ldots, \ ?X[\text{attr1}->\?Y], \ ?Y[\text{attr2}->\?Z], \ f(\text{?P->?_newvar}), \ f(?_\text{newvar}), \ldots
\]

i.e., the nested literals follow their hosts in the translation. Thus, writing terms in this way is considered a hint to the compiler, which indicates that bindings are propagated from \( ?X[\text{attr1}->\?Y] \) to \( ?Y[\text{attr2}->\?Z] \), etc. If, on the other hand, \( ?Y[\text{attr2}->\?Z] \) has only one solution then, perhaps, writing \( ?Y[\text{attr2}->\?Z], \ ?X[\text{attr1}->\?Y] \) might produce more efficient code.

Similar considerations apply to \( f(\text{?P.attr3}) \), but here \( ?P.\text{attr3} \) is computed first and the result is passed to the predicate \( f/1 \). Note that frames and truth-valued path expressions are not allowed as nested arguments in predicates and functions. That is, \( f(?Y[\text{attr2}->\?Z]) \) or \( f(?Y.\text{attr2}[]) \) would cause compiler to issue errors. However, pure path expressions, which have no truth values, can be nested inside predicates and functions. For instance, \( f(?Y.\text{attr2}) \) or even \( f(?Y[\text{foo}->\text{bar}].\text{attr2}) \) are acceptable except inside insert... and delete... primitives.

As with nested frame literals, the \( \mathcal{E} \text{RGO} \) compiler assumes that path expressions represent a hint that bindings are propagated left-to-right. In other words, in \( ?X.\ ?Y.\ ?Z, \ ?X \) will be bound first. Based on this, the oids of the objects \( ?X.\ ?Y \) are computed, and then the attribute \( ?Z \) is applied. In other words, the translation will be \( ?X[?Y->?\text{Newvar1}], \ ?\text{Newvar1}[?Z->?\text{Newvar2}] \).
Unfortunately, unlike databases, statistical information is not available to the ERGO compiler and only a few heuristics (such as variable binding analysis, which the compiler does not perform) can be used to optimize such queries. If the order chosen by the compiler is not right, the user may unnest the literals and place them in the right order in the rule body.

**Open calls vs. bound calls.** In Prolog it is much more efficient (space- and time-wise) to make one unbound call than multiple bound ones. For instance, suppose we have a class, cl, that has hundreds of members, and consider the following query:

\[
?- \ ?X:cl[\text{attr}->?Y].
\]

Here, Prolog would first evaluate the open call \(?X : cl\) and then for each answer \(x\) for \(?X\) it will evaluate \(x[\text{attr}->?Y]\). If the cost of computing \(x[\text{attr}->?Y]\) is higher than the cost of \(x : cl\) and the number of answers to \(?X[\text{attr}->?Y]\) is not significantly higher than the number of answers to \(?X:cl\), then the following query might be evaluated much faster:

\[
?- \ ?X[\text{attr}->?Y], \ ?X:cl.
\]

In this query, a single call \(?X[\text{attr}->?Y]\) is evaluated first and then \(x:cl\) is computed for each answer for \(?X\). Since, as we remarked, the cost of this call can be much smaller than the combined cost of multiple calls to \(x[\text{attr}->?Y]\) for different \(x\). If the number of bindings for \(?X\) in \(?X[\text{attr}->?Y]\) that are not members of class cl is small, the second query might take significantly less space and time.

The delay quantifiers \textit{wish} and \textit{must}, described in Section 35, can also be helpful in ensuring that certain variables are bound.

## 47 Compiler Directives

### 47.1 Executable vs. Compile-time Directives

Like a Prolog compiler, the ERGO compiler can take compiler directives. As in Prolog, these directives can be executable or compile-time, and this distinction is very important. Executable directives are treated as queries and they begin with \(?-\). Compile-time directives begin with :-.  

Executable directives are mostly used to control how the ERGO shell interprets the expressions that the user types in. These directives have no effect during the compilation of the knowledge base. Instead, when they are executed as queries they affect the shell. In contrast, compile-time directives affect the compilation of the files they occur in. Also, if a module is loaded into the main
module in the shell, then all compile time directives in that module are executed in the shell as well, so there is no need to explicitly execute these directives in the shell. ËRGO requires that all compile-time directives appear at the top of the file prior to the first appearance of a rule or a fact, because such directives have effect only after they are found and processed.

To better understand the issue, consider the following simple example (say, in the file test.ergo):

```
:- op{400,xfx,fff}.
a fff b.
?- ?X fff ?Y.
```

If one loads this example, it will execute correctly and return the bindings a and b for ?X and ?Y, respectively. If you execute the same query ?X fff ?Y in the ËRGO shell, the result will still be correct because ËRGO made sure that the directive op{400,xfx,fff} in test.ergo was executed in the shell as well. On the other hand, if the example were

```
?- op{400,xfx,fff}.
a fff b.
?- ?X fff ?Y.
```

then fff would be known to the shell, but, unfortunately, we will not get that far to find out: The compiler will issue an error, since fff will not be known as an operator during the compilation.

### Summary of directives.

The following is a summary of all supported compiler directives:

```
:- setsemantics{Option1, Option2, ...}.
```

Sets the semantic options in the current user module. The currently allowed options are:

- `equality=none` (default), `equality=basic`,
- `inheritance=none`, `inheritance=flogic` (default), `inheritance=monotonic`,
- `tabling=reactive` (default), `tabling=passive`,
- `tabling=variant` (default), `tabling=subsumptive`,
- `custom=none` (default), `custom=filename`.

The form `option=val1+val2+val3` is also supported. For instance, `tabling=variant+reactive`.

These options are explained in detail in Section 23.

```
?- setsemantics{Option1, Option2, ...}.
```

This is an executable version of the `setsemantics` directive. The following options can be used only with the executable version of `setsemantics`:
subclassing=strict (default), subclassing=nonstrict,
class_expressions=on, class_expressions=none (default),

?- setsemantics{Option1, Option2, ...}@module.
   Same as above, except that the semantics is set for the specified user module.

:- index{Arity-Argument}.
   Says that all tabled HiLog predicates of arity Arity should be indexed on argument number Argument (the count starts at 1). This directive should appear at the beginning of a module to have any effect. Normally predicates in ERGO are indexed on predicate name only. The above directive changes this so that indexing is done on the given argument number instead.

   Note that the index directive is not very useful for predicates that mostly contain facts, because these are trie-indexed anyway (regardless of what you say). Thus, this instruction is useful only for predicates with partially instantiated arguments that appear in the rule heads.

   This is an executable version of the index directive. The module of the predicates can be specified.

:- index{%Arity-Argument}.
   The index directive for non-tabled HiLog predicates.

?- (index{%Arity-Argument}@[module}).
   The executable index for non-tabled HiLog predicates.

:- op{precedence, type, operator}.
   Defines operator as a ERGO operator with the given precedence and type. The type is the same as in Prolog operators, i.e., fx, xf, xfy, etc. Note that the op directive is confined to the module in which it is executed or defined. For instance, if example.ergo has a call (a foo b)@bar, the symbol foo is declared as an operator in the knowledge base loaded to module bar, but not in example.ergo, then a syntax error will result, because example.ergo does not know about the operator declaration for foo.

:- op{precedence, type, [operator, ..., operator]}.
   Same as above, except that this directive defines a list of operators with the same precedence and type.

?- op{precedence, type, operator}@module.
   Same as above, except that a module is also given. However, unless the module is main, this directive acts as a no-op.
47.2 Miscellaneous Compiler Options

Sometimes it is desirable to pass miscellaneous compiler options to the ERGO compiler. To do this, ERGO provides the directive `compiler_options`. It takes one argument — a list of options that is understood by the underlying Prolog compiler. At present, the following options are supported:

- **production=on** — compile the file without various debugging features such as the rule Ids embedded in the heads and bodies of rules.

- **production=off** — compile the file in the development mode. In this mode, rule Id information is added to the heads and the bodies of the rules, which facilitates tracing and profiling of ERGO queries. This mode is the default. This compiler option was introduced to make it possible to override production mode when it is requested from the ERGO shell via the primitive `production(on)` (see Section 53.2).

- **expert=on** — allow advanced syntax. Do not turn this option on if you are not a very experienced ERGO user: the expert mode was introduced to prevent misuse by novice users. See Section 56 to learn about the features that are available only in the expert mode.

- **expert=off** — do not allow advanced syntax. Note that, like `production`, the expert mode is a compile-time option. In the ERGO shell, use `expert(on)` and `expert(off)`.

- **prolog=[Opt1,Opt2,...,OptN]** — pass the list of Prolog compiler options `[Opt1,Opt2,...,OptN]` to the underlying Prolog compiler. The `prolog` options are not checked by the ERGO compiler and are simply passed to the underlying Prolog engine. If any of the given options is invalid, runtime warnings or errors will result. Also, unlike `expert` and `production` options, the `prolog` option cannot be issued at run time via the ERGO shell.

- In ERGO, there is also the option `omni=on` (and `omni=off`) with the corresponding primitive `omni{...}`—see Section 21.

Example:

```
:- compiler_options{production=on,expert=on,prolog=[spec_repr]}.
```

will cause the module that contains this directive to be compiled without the special debugging features that slow the running code down. This will also pass the `spec_repr` option to the underlying Prolog compiler so it will perform the specialization optimization.\(^{24}\)

\(^{24}\) Although the `spec_repr` optimization option is the default in XSB, ERGO turns it off because, we believe, it is buggy and causes some ERGO queries to go wrong.
48 ERGO System Modules

ERGO provides a number of useful libraries that the user can use. These libraries are statically preloaded into modules that are accessible through the special \modname syntax, and they are called system modules. We describe the functionality of these modules below. Some of these modules also have longer synonyms. These synonyms are mentioned below, if they exist.

48.1 Input and Output

This library simplifies access to the most common Prolog I/O facilities. This library is preloaded into the system module \io and can be accessed using the \io syntax.

The purpose of the I/O library is not to replace the standard I/O predicates with ERGO methods, but rather to relieve the user from the need to do explicit conversion of arguments between the HiLog representation of terms used in ERGO and the standard Prolog representation of the underlying engine.\footnote{See Section 18 for a discussion of the problems associated with this representation mismatch.} The methods and predicates accessible through the \io library are listed below. Note that some operations are defined as transactional methods and others as predicates. This is because we use the object-oriented representation only where it makes sense — we avoid introducing additional classes and objects that require more typing just for the sake of keeping the syntax object-oriented.

Standard I/O interface. This interface to input-output uses the concept of default streams that can be opened with see (for input) and tell (for output). Subsequent see/tell commands push the current streams to the respective input and output stacks and open new default streams. Subsequent reads and writes operate with those default streams. The commands seen and told close the current default streams and pop up the appropriate streams from the appropriate stacks, making them the default streams. The seeing and telling commands obtain references to the current default streams. If these streams are pushed on the stack and are no longer the default ones, those references can still be used to write to or read from the streams that are no longer default. This could be useful, for example, if one wants to copy one file to another. The following is a list of commands in this interface followed by some examples. Again, keep in mind that all the calls below must be invoked with \io.

- see(\seeFilename), \seeFilename[see] — open \seeFilename and make it the current input stream. The file can live remotely at some URL. In that case, \seeFilename must be instantiated to the form url(...).
- seeing(\seeStream) — binds \seeStream to the current input stream.
• **seen** — closes the current input stream.

• **tell(?Filename), ?Filename[tell]** — opens ?Filename as the current output stream. The file can live remotely at some URL. In that case, ?Filename must be instantiated to the form `url(...)`. In that case, ERGO will attempt to use the HTTP POST request to store the file remotely.

• **telling(?Stream)** — binds ?Stream to the current output stream.

• **told** — closes the current output stream.

• **write(?Obj)** — writes ?Obj to the current output stream.

• **writeln(?Obj)** — same as above, except that the newline character is output after ?Obj.

• **write(?Obj,?Options), writeln(?Obj,?Options)** — like write(?Obj) and writeln(?Obj) but takes the ?Options argument, which is a list. At present, the only options in that list that are supported are `oid` and `goal`. The difference shows only when printing reified statements: with the `oid` option, ?Obj is printed as an object, while with `goal` it is printed as a goal (without the reification symbol). For instance,

  ```prolog
  ?- write(${p(1)},[oid])@\io.
  ${p(1)}
  ?- write(${p(1)},[goal])@\io.
  p(1)
  ```

  If the argument is not a reified formula then the two options give the same result. The 1-argument versions `write(?Obj), writeln(?Obj)` are equivalent to `write(?Obj,[oid]), writeln(?Obj,[oid])`, respectively.

• **nl** — writes the newline character to the current output stream.

• **write_canonical(?Term)** — write ?Term to standard output in canonical Prolog form.

• **fmt_write(?Format,?Term)** — C-style formatted output to the standard output. See the XSB manual, volume 2, for the description of all the details. Here we just mention that the format is an atom ‘...’ whose structure is like in C (some formats might not be supported) with the addition of the format specified `%S`, which can take any term. ?Term must have the format `args(arg1, ..., argn)` (i.e., all the arguments to be printed must be grouped under a single functor; the name of the functor is immaterial).

• **fmt_write(?Format,?Term,?Options)** — like fmt_write(?Format,?Term), but take options whose meaning is the same as in case of `write/writeln` above.
• `fmt_write_string(?String,?Format,?Obj)` — same as above, but binds `?String` to the result. See the XSB manual for the details.

• `fmt_write_string(?String,?Format,?Obj,?Options)` — same as above, but takes options whose meaning is the same as in the case of `write/writeln` above.

Stream-based I/O. Stream-based I/O is like the standard I/O interface except that it does not use the default streams that can be pushed to or popped from the stack of streams. Instead, there is a notion of standard input and output streams, which are usually associated with an interactive window, and user-defined streams. Standard input and output streams always exist, while user-defined streams are created and destroyed when files are open and closed. This is somewhat similar to the I/O interface described earlier, but nothing gets pushed on stacks. Instead, all read and write operations must use the appropriate streams explicitly.

For reading, we recommend to use only the stream-based I/O and so we omitted most of the read operations from the standard I/O interface above. Note that to read an entire file via the various read operations below, it is recommended to use the fail-loop idiom like

```prolog
%do_read(?Stream) :- ?Stream[some_read_operation(...), ..., some_read_operation(...)] -> ?Result]@\io, process_result(?Result), \false.
%do_read(?Stream) :- ?Stream[close]@\io.
```

where `some_read_operation` can be any of the read methods described below.

• `?Filename[open(?Mode,?Stream)]` or `?Filename[open(?Mode)->?Stream]` — opens `?Filename` with mode `?Mode` (which can be `read`, `write`, `append`, `write_binary`, or `append_binary`) and binds `?Stream` to the stream Id. The file can live remotely at some URL. In that case, `?Filename` must have the form `url(...)`. The modes `write_binary` and `append_binary` are used in Windows only. In Unix-based systems (Linux, Mac, etc.), these modes coincide with `write` and `append`, respectively.

One way to think of `?Filename[open(read,?Stream)]` is that it is like `see(?Filename)` followed by `seeing(?Stream)`. Similarly, `?Filename[open(write,?Stream)]` is like `tell(?Filename)` followed by `telling(?Stream)`. But `open` provides one more option, `append`, which does not exist in stream-based I/O, plus the binary modes for Windows.

• `?Stream[close]` — closes `?Stream`. It is similar to `told` but it can close any stream, not just the default one.
• ?Stream[prolog_read->?Result] — bind ?Result to the next Prolog term in the previously open input stream ?Stream. Each term must be terminated with a period. After being read in, each term is converted to HiLog. If the term being read is not in the form of a Prolog term, ?Term gets bound to prolog_read_error.

• ?Stream[write(?Obj)], ?Stream[writeln(?Obj)] — like write(?Obj), writeln(?Obj) but write to a previously open output ?Stream instead of the current output stream.

• ?Stream[write(?Obj,?Option)], ?Stream[writeln(?Obj,?Option)] — like write(?Obj,?Option), writeln(?Obj,?Option) but write to a previously open output ?Stream instead of the current output stream.

• ?Stream[fmt_write(?Format,?O)] — same as fmt_write(?Format,?O), but uses ?Stream for the output.

• ?Stream[fmt_write(?Format,?O,?Options)] — same as fmt_write(?Format,?Term,?Options) but uses a previously open stream.

• ?Stream[fmt_read(?Format) -> ?Result] — formatted read; uses ?Stream for input. ?Format is a C-style format string with some limitations (and a new format %S, which accepts any term). See the XSB manual for details. If ?Result is returned unbound, it means that there was a formatting read error. In that case, the current position within the input file would not change and, if one continues to persist with exactly the same read command (e.g., using the fail-loop) then an infinite loop may result.

• ?Stream[write_canonical(?Term)] — write out ?Term using the canonical format. Uses ?Stream for output.

• ?Stream[read_canonical->?Term] — reading canonical terms (i.e., no infix, postfix, prefix operators); uses ?Stream for input. As with prolog_read, each term must be terminated with a period and is converted to HiLog. If the term being read is not in the canonical form, ?Term gets bound to read_canonical_error.

  The read_canonical method is much faster than the prolog_read method described earlier, but it cannot read non-canonical terms like a+b. So, if a file contains only

• ?Stream[ergo_read->?Term] — reads ERGO terms from ?Stream, including HiLog and reified terms. Each term must be terminated with a period. If input is not a valid ERGO term, ?Term gets bound to flora_read_error.

  This is similar to the prolog_read and read_canonical methods, but is more general, as this method also understands HiLog (e.g., a(b)(c)) and reified (e.g., $\{Mary[age->12]\}$) terms. The three methods have significant overlap, where read_canonical is least general, but also the fastest, prolog_read is more general, but slower, and ergo_read is most general
and also the slowest. Therefore, if the contents of a file permits so, \texttt{read\_canonical} should be preferred.

Note that this method is similar to \texttt{readAll} in the module \texttt{\textbackslash parse} in Section 48.7. The difference is that it is simpler to use: it does not return any status or error information and instead binds \texttt{?Term} to \texttt{flora\_read\_error} in case of an error. It also ignores spaces and newlines.

- \texttt{?Stream[readline(?Type) -> ?String]} — reads a line from file; uses \texttt{?Stream} for input. Binds \texttt{?String} to the line that was just read. \texttt{?Type} is either \texttt{atom} or \texttt{charlist}. The former means that \texttt{?String} is to be bound to a Prolog atom (ERGO symbol), while the latter tells the system to convert the line to a \textit{list of characters} (usually used when further parsing is required). If the line that was read in ends with a newline, that newline character is retained in \texttt{?String}.

Here are some examples. To read a file, one must open it first. If, say, \texttt{foo.txt} has \texttt{foo. p(a)}. then the following will result:

\begin{verbatim}
?- (see('foo.txt'), seeing(?Stream),
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
?X = foo
?Y = p(a)
\end{verbatim}

The following illustrates writing to a file.

\begin{verbatim}
?- (tell('foo.txt'), telling(?Stream1), tell('bar.txt'),
    ?Stream1[writeln(abc)], writeln(cde), told, ?Stream1[close])@\io.
\end{verbatim}

In this case, the files \texttt{foo.txt} and \texttt{bar.txt} will be created (or erased, if they exist) and \texttt{abd} will be written out to the first file and \texttt{cde} to the second. In more detail, the first \texttt{tell} opens \texttt{foo.txt} and the next \texttt{telling} command obtains a reference to the stream associated with that file. The next \texttt{tell} opens \texttt{bar.txt}. The default stream now becomes associated with that file, but we still have a reference \texttt{?Stream1} to the first stream, so we can write to it, which is done by the next command. After that, \texttt{cde} gets written to the default stream and \texttt{told} closes that stream. The last command closes (the non-default) \texttt{?Stream1} explicitly.

To read from or write to the window through which the user interacts with a running session of \texttt{ERGO}, one does not need to open (or \texttt{see/tell}) any files: when \texttt{ERGO} starts, the default input and output streams are connected to that window. For instance,

\begin{verbatim}
?- write(foobar)@\io.
\end{verbatim}
will display foobar to the user unless the current default was changed by an earlier tell command. If the user needs to work with several files at once, he must keep track of the open streams by binding them to variables, as in the above example.

**Debugging output.** The above output methods and predicates make every effort to present the output in the valid ERGO syntax. However, sometimes—usually for debugging—one would like to see the internal representation of certain ERGO constructs. Using `write(...)@prolog` is the ultimate way to see the internals, while `setdisplaymode{...}` and `setdisplayschema{...}` can be seen as an intermediate device.

There are these display modes: `default`, `stickydefault`, `answer`, `deepanswer`, and `debug`. At present, the only difference between `debug` and `default` is that in the `debug` mode the Skolems are written out using their internal representation while in the default mode the output looks like a ERGO term. For instance,

```prolog
? setdisplaymode{debug}.
?- insert{p(#)}, p(?_X), writeln(?_X)@io.
$_$$_ergo'skolem2|_2

? setdisplaymode{default}.
?- insert{p(#)}, p(?_X), writeln(?_X)@io.
\#
```

In the `answer` mode the values of the variables bound to Skolems or IRI prefixes are shown both in the user-readable as well as the internal representation. (Skolems and IRI prefixes that appear as arguments to other terms are not shown with their internal representations.) This mode is set automatically when printing out answers:

```prolog
:- iriprefix{foo="http://foo.bar.example.com"}. p(#foo,f(#2)).
?- p(?X,?Y).
?X = #foo  (_$_$_ergo'skolem2|foo'1)
?Y = f(#2)
?- prefix{foo,?expansion}.
?expansion = foo#' (http://foo.bar.example.com)
```

Note that for ?Y the internal representation of the Skolem constant is not shown because it appears as an argument, and including the internal representation would be confusing. If, however, one wishes to see internal representations of Skolem constants at any depth, setting the display mode to `deepanswer` will do the trick. To suppress showing the internal representation completely, set the
display mode to **stickydefault**. The difference between this mode and **default** temporarily changes to **answer** when answers are being printed, while in the **stickydefault** mode this automatic switch does not happen.

One other useful display mode is **visiblechars**; it affects **write(...)**@\io predicates only. In that mode, invisible characters like backspace or newline, that have visible ASCII representation are shown using that representation. For instance,

```prolog
?- ?_X = 'abc\bdef\n123', writeln(displayed_as=?_X)@\io.
displayed_as = 'abdef
123'
```

but

```prolog
?- setdisplaymode(\visiblechars\), ?_X = 'abc\bdef\n123', writeln(displayed_as=?_X)@\io.
displayed_as = 'abc\bdef\n123'
```

**ERGO** also provides the primitive **displaymode{?X}**. which can be used to find out the current mode in effect. At present, only one mode can be in effect, so setting a new mode cancels the old one.

The primitive **setdisplayschema{...}** can be used to affect whether the answers and terms are printed using the **ERGO**’s representation or the internal Prolog representation. For instance,

```prolog
?- setdisplayschema(\raw\).
?- ?X=p(?p).
?X = flapply(p,_h9195)
```

while in the default schema, **flora** (or **ergo**, in **ERGO**), the answer would be shown as

```
?- ?X=p(?p).
?X = p(?_h9195)
```

This display schema also affects the **write(...)**@\io predicates. Another useful display schema is **tmpraw**. As the name suggests, this is a temporary raw mode that has effect only during one query. When the query is finished, the display schema returns to be **flora** or **ergo**, depending on the system. For instance,

```
?- setdisplayschema(\tmpraw\), ?X=p(?).  // has effect just for this query
?X = flapply(p,_h12379)  // temporarily used the raw schema to show ?X
?- ?X=p(?).
?X = p(?_h12)  // display schema returned to be flora/ergo in next query
```
Finally, the primitive \texttt{displayschema}?\texttt{X}\texttt{}} can be used to tell which schema is currently in effect. For instance,

\begin{verbatim}
?- displayschema{\texttt{X}}.
\texttt{X} = \texttt{flora}
\end{verbatim}

\textbf{Common file operations.} The \texttt{\texttt{io}} module also provides a class \texttt{File}, which has methods for the most common file operations. These include:

- \texttt{File[exists(?F)]}. True if file \texttt{?F} exists.
- \texttt{File[isdir(?F)]}. True if file \texttt{?F} is a directory.
- \texttt{File[isplain(?F)]}. True if file \texttt{?F} is a plain file, not a directory.
- \texttt{File[readable(?F)]}. True if file \texttt{?F} is readable.
- \texttt{File[writable(?F)]}. True if the file is writable.
- \texttt{File[executable(?F)]}. True if the file is executable.
- \texttt{File[modtime(?F)->?T]}. Binds \texttt{?T} to the last modification time of \texttt{?F}.
- \texttt{File[mkdir(?Dir)]}. Makes a directory named after the value of \texttt{?Dir}.
- \texttt{File[rmdir(?Dir)]}. Removes the directory \texttt{?Dir}.
- \texttt{File[chdir(?Dir)]}. Changes the current directory to \texttt{?Dir}.
- \texttt{File[cwd->?Dir]}. Binds \texttt{?Dir} to the current working directory in the shell.
- \texttt{File[link(?F,?Dest)]}. Creates a link named after \texttt{?F} to the existing file \texttt{?Dest}.
- \texttt{File[unlink(?F)]}. Removes the link \texttt{?F}.
- \texttt{File[remove(?F)]}. Removes the file \texttt{?F}.
- \texttt{File[tmpfilename(?F)]}. Binds \texttt{?F} to a temporary file with a completely new name.
- \texttt{File[isabsolute(?F)]}. True if \texttt{?F} is an absolute path name.
- \texttt{File[rename(?F,?To)]}. Renames file \texttt{?F} to file \texttt{?To}.
- \texttt{File[basename(?F) -> ?Base]}. Binds \texttt{?Base} to the base name of file path \texttt{?F}. For instance, \texttt{?- File[basename(’/a/b/cde’) -> ?Base]}. would bind \texttt{?Base} to \texttt{cde}. 
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• File[extension(?F) -> ?Ext]. Binds ?Ext to the extension of the file ?F. For instance,
• File[dirname(?F) -> ?Dir]. Binds ?Dir to the directory name of file ?F.
• File[expand(?F) -> ?Expanded]. Expands the file ?F by attaching the directory name
   (if the file is not absolute) and binds ?Expanded to that expansion.
• File[newerthan(?F,?F2)]. True if ?F is a newer file than ?F2.
• File[copy(?F,?To)]. Copies the contents of the file ?F to ?To.

48.2 Storage Control

\textit{ERGO} keeps the facts that are part of the knowledge base or those that are inserted at runtime
in special data structures called \textit{storage tries}. The system module `db`, accessible through the
module reference `@\db`, provides primitives for controlling this storage. This module also has a
longer synonym `\storage`.

• commit — commits all changes made by transactional updates. If this statement is executed
  in the middle of an update transaction, changes made by transactional updates prior to this
  will be committed and will not be undone even if a subsequent subgoal fails.
• commit(?Module) — commits all changes made by transactional updates to facts in the user
  module ?Module. Transactional updates to other modules are unaffected.
• purgedb(?Module) — deletes all facts previously inserted into the storage associated with
  module ?Module.

48.3 System Control

The system module `\sys` provides primitives that affect the global behavior of the system. It is
accessible though the system module reference `@\sys` (or through its synonym `\system`).

• Libpath[add(?Path)] — adds ?Path to the library search path. This works similarly to the
  PATH environment variable of Unix and Windows in that when the compiler or the loader are
  trying to locate a file specified by its name only (without directory) then they examine the
  files stored in the directories on the library search path.
  Using Libpath[add(a(?Path))] will move the directory to the front of the library search
  path (deleting any other occurrences of that directory on that search path).
  Using Libpath[add(push(?Path))] will put the directory at the front of the library search
  path. The other occurrences of that directory on the search path stay put.
• **Libpath[remove(?Path)]** — removes one ?Path from the library search path.

• **Libpath[removeall(?Path)]** — removes all occurrences of ?Path from the library search path.

• **Libpath[query(?Path)]** — queries the library search path. If ?Path is bound, checks if the specified directory is on the library search path. Otherwise, binds (through backtracking) ?Path to each directory on the library search path.

• **Tables[abolish]** — discards all tabled data in Prolog.

This module also provides the following amenities:

• **Method[mustDefine(?Mode)]** — affects the system behavior when stumbling upon an undefined predicate or method. This method is described separately, in Section 45.1.

• **abort(?Message)** — prints ?Message on the standard error stream and terminates the current execution. Message can also be in the form (?M1, ?M2, ..., ?Mn). In this case, all the component strings are concatenated before printing them out.

User aborts can be caught as follows:

```
?- catch(?Goal, ERGO_ABORT(ERGO_USER_ABORT(?Message),?_), ?Handler)
```

In order to be able to use the predefined constants **ERGO_ABORT** and **ERGO_USER_ABORT** the file must contain the include statement

```
#include "flora_exceptions"
```

• **warning(?Message)** — prints a warning header, then message, ?Message, and continues. Output goes to the standard error stream. ?Message can be of the form (?M1, ?M2, ..., ?Mn).

• **message(?Message)** — Like warning/1, but does not print the warning header. ?Message can be of the form (?M1, ?M2, ..., ?Mn).

• **System[type->?Info]** — returns information about the system type. ?Info, for example, could be bound to *unix/linux/64, macos/darwin/64, windows/windows/32*, depending on the system type.
48.4 Type and Cardinality Checking

This system module of ERGO provides methods for testing type and cardinality constraints of the methods defined in the ERGO knowledge base. The module defines the method check in classes Type and Cardinality of module \texttt{typecheck} (or, abbreviated, \texttt{tpck}). This method is described in Section 45.3.

48.5 Data Types

The system module \texttt{basetype} of ERGO provides methods for accessing the components of data types such as \texttt{dateTime}, \texttt{iri}, and so on. Data types are described in Section 41.

48.6 Sets, Maps, and Dictionaries

This section introduces the built-in ERGO module, called \texttt{set}, which provides two data structures:

- Sets: a data structure that provides containers for terms and supports
  - efficient membership search, whose complexity is independent on the size of the set (this is a big difference compared to lits)
  - duplicate elimination

- Single-valued key-value pairs: a data structure that efficiently associates search keys with values, where each key is associated with at most one value. This data structure is known as a map in Java, dictionary in Python, and associative array in Perl. For brevity, we shall use the term map for this structure.

- Multi-valued key-value pairs: a map allows one to associate at most one value with each key. ERGO makes it possible to have map-like structures that permits association of multiple values with any key. We will call this data structure a multi-valued map, of \texttt{mv-map}.

A set or a map is identified via user-selected abstract symbol (a Prolog atom) and is created the first time something is inserted into that data structure. The set/map identifier is \textit{global}, i.e., it does not need to be saved somewhere between uses in different rules. For example,

```
?- myset123[insert([foo,bar,p(234)])]@set.
```

creates a set identified by the symbol \texttt{myset123} and inserts three elements into it: \texttt{foo}, \texttt{bar}, and \texttt{p(234)}. A set or a map exists until it is destroyed via
It is a good idea to destroy sets and maps that are no longer needed, to free up space (these structures are not garbage-collected by the system).

There is no significant difference between the data structures used for sets, maps, and mv-maps. The only real difference lies in the APIs, i.e., the operations that are used to work with sets and maps. Because of this affinity, many API operations are common to sets, maps, and mv-maps.

### 48.6.1 API for Working with Both Sets, Maps and MV-Maps

- **?SetMap[exists]@\set** — true if ?SetMap is bound to a set/map/mv-map that was created and not destroyed. For example, set1[exists]@\set.

- **?SetMap[empty]@\set** — true if ?SetMap is bound to a set/map/mv-map that is empty or non-existent.

- **?SetMap[destroy]@\set** — destroys the set/map/mv-map that is identified via the atom bound to ?SetMap.

- **?SetMap[union(?SetMap2)->?SetMap3]@\set** — ?SetMap3 becomes the union of ?SetMap and ?SetMap2. The variables ?SetMap, ?SetMap2, ?SetMap3 must be bound to symbols, which do not need to be distinct. If, for example, ?SetMap2 and ?SetMap3 are bound to the same symbol, abc, and ?SetMap is bound to foo, i.e., foo[union(abc)->abc]@\set, then the union of the sets/maps identified by abc and foo is computed and gets associated (destructively) with the symbol abc.

  For example, set1[union(set2)->set3]@\set.

  This expression has a shortcut: set3 \is set1++set2.

- **?SetMap[minus(?SetMap2)->?SetMap3]@\set** — ?SetMap3 becomes associated with the set/map/mv-map that is a set-difference of ?SetMap and ?SetMap2. All three arguments must be bound to symbols, and ?SetMap2 may be bound to the same symbol as ?SetMap3 or ?SetMap.

  For instance, abc[minus(foo)->foo]@\set computes the difference of the set/map/mv-map identified by abc and the set/map/mv-map identified by foo and then foo becomes associated with that computed set/map/mv-map.

  Example: set1[minus(set2)->set3]@\set.

  The expression set1[minus(set2)->set3]@\set has a shortcut: set3 \is set1-set2.

- **?SetMap[intersect(?SetMap2)->?SetMap3]@\set** — ?SetMap3 becomes associated with the set/map/mv-map that is a set-intersection of ?SetMap and ?SetMap2. All three ar-
guments must be bound to symbols, and neither \texttt {?SetMap} nor \texttt {?SetMap2} can be bound to the same symbol as \texttt {?SetMap3}.

Example: \texttt {set1[intersect(set2)->set3]@\set}.

The expression \texttt {set1[intersect(set2)->set3]@\set} has a shortcut: \texttt {set3 \is set1&\&set2}.

- \texttt {?SetMap[subset(?SetMap2)]@\set} — true if \texttt {?SetMap} identifies a set that is a subset/submap of the set/map/mv-map identified by \texttt {?SetMap2}.

\texttt {ERGO} provides a convenient shortcut for this method: \texttt {?SetMap \subset ?SetMap2}.

- \texttt {?SetMap[equal(?SetMap2)]@\set} — true if \texttt {?SetMap} identifies a set that is equal to the set/map/mv-map identified by \texttt {?SetMap2}.

- \texttt {?SetMap[copy->?SetMap2]@\set} — \texttt {?SetMap2} becomes associated with a copy of the set/map/mv-map identified by \texttt {?SetMap}.

- \texttt {?SetMap[tolist->?List]@\set} — binds \texttt {?List} to the sorted list of elements in the set/map/mv-map identified by \texttt {?SetMap}. In the case of maps and mv-maps, the members of the list have the form \texttt {key=value}. For a set, the members in the list are simply the elements of the set.

- \texttt {?SetMap[type->?Type]@\set} — binds \texttt {?Type} to the type of the structure identified by \texttt {?SetMap}. The possible values are \texttt {set}, \texttt {map}, and \texttt {mv} (for mv-maps).

48.6.2 API for Working with Sets

- \texttt {?Set[insert(?Element)]@\set} — \texttt {?Element} gets inserted in \texttt {?Set}. If \texttt {?Element} exists in the set already, the insertion simply succeeds without changing the set. If \texttt {?Element} is a list, all the elements in the list are inserted (except those that are already in \texttt {?Set}).

Note that \texttt {?Element} can have variables. For example, \texttt {set123[insert([p(a),q(1,?X)])]@\set}.

- \texttt {?Set[delete(?Element)]@\set} — \texttt {?Element} gets deleted from \texttt {?Set}. If \texttt {?Element} is not in the set, the deletion simply succeeds without changing the set. If \texttt {?Element} is a list, all the elements in the list are deleted (except those that were not in \texttt {?Set} to begin with).

Note that \texttt {?Element} can have variables. In that case, \texttt {?Element} will be non-deterministically unified with some member of the set (if at all), and that member will be deleted.

- \texttt {?Set[member->?Element]@\set} — true if \texttt {?Element} is bound to a term that unifies with some member of the set identified by \texttt {?Set}.

\texttt {ERGO} provides a convenient shortcut for this method: \texttt {?Element \in ?Set}. 
48.6.3 API for Working with Maps

- ?Map[mapinsert(?Key=?Value)]@\set — insert the corresponding key-value pair into the map.
  If ?Key already has a value then: if that value unifies with ?Value then the above call succeeds; otherwise, it fails. For example, map123[mapinsert(foo=23)]@\set.

- ?Map[mapreplace(?Key=?Value)]@\set — like mapinsert but if the key has a value already, that old value is removed and ?Value is associated with ?Key instead. This call always succeeds.

- ?Map[mapdelete(?Key)]@\set — delete the value associated with ?Key. If a key-pair with that key exists, the call fails.

- ?Map[maperase(?Key)]@\set — like mapdelete, but this call succeeds in all cases, whether the key in question exists or not.


48.6.4 API for Working with MV-Maps

- ?MV[mvminsert(?Key=?Value)]@\set — insert the corresponding key-value pair into the mv-map.
  If ?Key already has a value then: if that value unifies with ?Value then the above call succeeds; otherwise, it fails. For example, mv123[mvminsert(foo=23)]@\set.

- ?MV[mvmdelete(?Key=?Value)]@\set — delete a ?Value associated with ?Key. If a key-pair with that key exists, does nothing and succeeds.

- ?MV[mvmerase(?Key)]@\set — like mvmdelete, but deletes all values associated with ?Key. Succeeds regardless of whether ?Key exists in the mv-map or not.

- ?MV[mvmfind(?Key)->?Value]@\set — ?Value gets bound to a value associated with ?Key in ?MV. Fails if no such key exists in the mv-map.

48.7 Reading and Compiling Input Terms

Sometimes it may be necessary for an application to read and compile ERGO statements from an input source. To this end, the \parse system library provides the following predicates and methods.
• \texttt{read(?Code,?Stat)@\texttt{parse}.}
• \texttt{read(?Module)(?Code,?Stat)@\texttt{parse}.}

Read the next term from the standard input and compile it. The resulting term is bound to the variable \texttt{?Code}. The term can also be a reified formula and even a reified rule. Such a formula/rule can be used in a query or inserted into the knowledge base as appropriate.

The second form does the following: If the input term is not reified, the \texttt{?Module} parameter has no effect. If the formula is reified \textit{and} has no explicit module (i.e., \texttt{$\{\texttt{foo}\}$} as opposed to \texttt{$\{\texttt{foo}@@\texttt{bar}\}$}), then it will be built for the module specified in \texttt{?Module}. If \texttt{?Module} is unbound then the default module \texttt{main} is assumed.

The variable \texttt{?Stat} is bound to the status code returned by the call and has the form \texttt{[OutcomeFlag, EOF\_flag, ErrorList]}), where:

\begin{itemize}
    \item \texttt{OutcomeFlag = null/ok/error}
        \begin{itemize}
            \item \texttt{null} - a blank line was read, no code generated (\texttt{?Code = null})
            \item \texttt{ok} - good code was generated, no errors
            \item \texttt{error} - parsing/compilation errors
        \end{itemize}
    \item \texttt{EOF\_flag = eof/not\_eof}
        \begin{itemize}
            \item \texttt{not\_eof} - end-of-file has not been reached
            \item \texttt{eof} - if it has been reached.
        \end{itemize}
    \item \texttt{ErrorList:} if \texttt{OutcomeFlag=null/ok}, then this list would be empty.
        if \texttt{OutcomeFlag=error}, then this would be a list of the form \texttt{[error(N1, N2, Message), ...]}, where \texttt{N1, N2} encode the line and character numbers, which are largely irrelevant in this context. \texttt{Message} is an error message. Error messages are displayed.
\end{itemize}

Example:

\begin{verbatim}
?- read(?Code,?Stat)@\texttt{parse}.
\texttt{f(a).} \texttt{-----user input}

?Code = \texttt{f(a)}
?Stat = \texttt{[ok, not\_eof]}

?- read(?Code,?Stat)@\texttt{parse}.
\texttt{$\{\texttt{a[b->c]}\}@\texttt{foo}.} \texttt{-----user input}

?Code = \texttt{$\{\texttt{a[b -> c]}\}@\texttt{foo}]
?Stat = \texttt{[ok, not\_eof]}
\end{verbatim}

Note that \texttt{read@\texttt{parse}} reads just one term from the input and succeeds. If called repeatedly, it
will read the second, third, etc., term from the input stream. On reaching the end of file, ?Stat will be bound to [null, eof].


These versions of read@\parse are similar to the above except that the input comes from an input stream ?Stream, which must be open previously, and not from the standard input.

The second form of this API call supplies a module for reified terms, as explained above.

- readAll(?Code, ?Stat)@\parse.
- readAll(?Module)(?Code, ?Stat)@\parse.

Used for reading terms one-by-one and returning answers interactively. The meaning of the arguments is the same. Under one-at-a-time solution (\one), will wait for input, return compiled code, then wait for input again, if the user types ";". If the user types RET then this predicate succeeds and exits. Under all-solutions semantics (\all), will wait for inputs and process them, but will not return answers unless the file is closed (e.g., Ctl-D at standard input).

The second form of this API call supplies a module for reified terms, as explained above.


Like readAll(?Code, ?Stat)@\parse but the input comes from the input stream ?Stream, which must be open in advance. After finishing working with the stream, it should be closed.

The second form of this API call provides a module for reified terms, as above.

Note: there is a simpler version of this method in the system module \io. It is called ergo_read (and ergo_read(?Module)) and is described in Section 48.1.

- ?Source[readAll(?CodeList)]@\parse.
- ?Source[readAll(?Module)(?CodeList)]@\parse.

This collects all answers from a source, which can be either a file or a string. If the source is a string, it should be specified as string(Str), where Str is either an atom or a variable that is bound to an atom. If the source is a file, then it should be specified as file(FileName), where FileName is an atom that specifies a file name (or a variable bound to it). ?CodeList gets bound to a list of the form [code(TermCode1, Status1), code(TermCode2, Status2), ...], where TermCode is the compiled code of a term in the source, and ?Status is the status of the compilation for this term. It has the form [OutcomeFlag, EOF_flag|ErrorList], as explained before.

The second form of this call provides an explicit module for building reified terms, as above.
48.8 Displaying ERGO Terms and Goals

The system library loaded into the module `\show` can be used to obtain printable representation of ERGO terms and goals. This is needed when one needs to show those terms to the user in a form that the user can recognize (rather than in the internal form into which the terms are compiled).

The available methods are:

- `?Term[show->?Result]` — `?Result` is bound to an atom that represents the printable view of the term. For instance,

  ?- `{d(c,k,?M)}[show->?P]\show.
  ?P = '${d(c,k,_h0)@main}'

- `[f(a,?X),b,${d(c,k,?M)}][show->?Result]\show.
  ?P = '[f(a,?_h0), b, ${d(c,k,_h1)@main}]

- `?Term[show(?Option)->?Result]` — like the above but also takes an option argument, which can be `goal` or `oid`. `?Term[show->?Result]` is the same as `?Term[show(oid)->?Result]`. The `goal` option affects the display of reified statements only. In that case, these statements are shown as goals (without the reification symbol), while with `oid` they are shown as objects. For instance,

  ?- `{p(a,b)}[show(oid) -> ?R]\show.
  ?R = '${p(a,b)@main}'

  ?- `{p(a,b)}[show(goal) -> ?R]\show.
  ?R = 'p(a,b)'

For HiLog terms, which are not reified, the two forms give the same result. For instance,

  ?- p(a,b)[show(oid) -> ?R]\show.
  ?R = 'p(a,b)'

- `?List[splice(?Separator)->?Result]` — `?Result` is bound to an atom that represents the printable view of the sequence of elements in `?List` with `?Separator` (an atom) inserted in-between every pair of consecutive elements. For instance,
?- [f(a,?X),b,$\{d(c,k,?M)\}] [splice(’ ‘)->?P] @show.

?P = ‘f(a,?_h0) b $\{d(c,k,?_h1)@main}’

?- [f(a,?X),b,$\{d(c,k,?M)\}] [splice(’| ‘)->?P] @show.

?P = ‘f(a,?_h0)| |b| |$\{d(c,k,?_h1)@main}’

49 ErgoText

ErgoText is a high-level facility intended to facilitate knowledge entry via natural language (NL) style phrases and is primarily targeting engineers who are not highly skilled ERGO users. However, skilled ERGO users may also find ErgoText very convenient in many situations.

ErgoText documents typically have two parts: the actual knowledge base that contains template NL phrases (with the usual extension .ergo) and another file, with the extension .ergotxt, which contains template definitions. Template definitions are typically created by a highly skilled ERGO user; they provide mappings from NL templates to ERGO statements. The interesting feature of ErgoText is that the NL text from the templates can be freely mixed with ERGO statements in the same document or even in the same rule. When a text phrase is found, template definitions are automatically looked up. If no matching template exists for the phrase in question, a compile-time error is issued. Otherwise, the ERGO template definition is used instead of the phrase.

49.1 ErgoText Knowledge Bases

In this section, we assume that we have a file, mykb.ergo, which contains ERGO statements intermixed with ErgoText phrases. Before such phrases can be used, the template definition file (say, mytemplates.ergotxt)\(^{26}\) must be loaded either by executing the runtime query

?- ergotext{mytemplates}.

before compiling mykb.ergo or it must be declared at compile time by including the directive

:- ergotext{mytemplates}.

(note: :-, not ?-) at the top of mykb.ergo. Note that mytemplates.ergotxt must be locatable, i.e., ERGO must be able to find it. If the above ergotext query or directive appears inside a

\(^{26}\) It is perfectly fine to use the same base name for the template file, i.e., mykb.ergotxt.
file, such as `mykb.ergo`, then `mytemplates.ergotxt` must be a path relative to the folder where `mykb.ergo` resides. It can also be an absolute path name, but this is strongly discouraged because it will make your knowledge base non-portable between machines. Thus, if `mykb.ergo` and `mytemplates.ergotxt` are in the same directory then simply `ergotext{mytemplates}` will do. If, say, all templates are in the `templates_dir` subfolder with respect to the file `mykb.ergo` that contains the directive, then `ergotext{templates_dir/mytemplates}` would work (the forward slash will work both for Unix and Windows).

If, on the other hand, `ergotext{mytemplates}` is posed as a query on command line in the ERGO shell then `mytemplates.ergotxt` would typically be an absolute path name. It can also be a path name relative to the current folder, but in case of ERGO Studio it is not always obvious what the current folder is.

Invoking `ergotext{?X}` as a query with an unbound variable argument will bind the argument to the currently active template file or will fail if none is active.

Note that at most one ErgoText template is active at any given moment. The active template is determined by either the most recent query of the form `?- ergotext{...}` or (if set within a file) by the nearest previous directive `:- ergotext{...}` within the same (or include’d) file. This implies that a file can have several declared templates, but all the statements in-between the consecutive `:- ergotext` declarations will be interpreted by exactly one template. For instance, in

```prolog
:- ergotext{template1}.
statement1
:- ergotext{template2}.
statement2
statement3
:- ergotext{template3}.
statement4
statement5
```

the statements 2 and 3 will be interpreted using `template2` and statements 4 and 5 via `template3`. This also means that all the ErgoText phrases that appear in statements 1 to 3 must be defined in `template2.ergotxt`. If one is defined, say, in `template3` or in `template1` but not in `template2` then an error will be issued. It should be said, however, that using more than one template definition file per ERGO module is a bad idea. It is a sign of poor design and should be avoided.

An ErgoText phrase has the form

```
\(\text{word1 word2 \ldots wordN}\)
```

where each word is either an word, a HiLog term, including variables, or even an ISA or frame formula. Special symbols like parentheses, commas, semicolons, +, -, =, |, etc., are also allowed in
ErgoText phrases. They can be standalone symbols or play the role of punctuation. Note that NL words are a special case of HiLog terms. Note that words do not need to be in English or, for that matter, use Latin characters, but in case of non-Latin characters the words have to be enclosed in single quotes, like any atom that contains non-alphanumeric characters. This also applies to text fragments that contain single or double quotes. For instance,

\(\text{(My parent's house)}\)
\(\text{(My parent's house)}\)

will be rejected by the parser, but all of the ones below

\(\text{(My 'parent''s' house)}\)
\(\text{(My 'parent''s' house)}\)
\(\text{(My parent''s house)}\)

are fine. (Note that in the last case parent"s actually consists of three separate tokens: parent, " , and s and separating them with spaces will yield the same three tokens, parent " s, and the same template.)

The following is a sample ERGO knowledge base that consists mostly of ErgoText phrases, some of which (S3,S5) are intermixed with the normal ERGO syntax.

\(\text{(Tom is not only a Student, but also a (salaried) Employee)}\). \hspace{1cm} // S1
\(\text{(If ?someone has ?something and paid for it then s/he likes it)}\). \hspace{1cm} // S2
\(\text{(?X cares for ?Y!), ?Y[inGoodShape] :-} \) \hspace{1cm} // S3
\(\text{(?X has ?Y!), ?Y:ValuableThing.} \)
\(\text{(insert rule: if ?X has more than 5M then he is rich)}\). \hspace{1cm} // S4
?- delete{\text{(Tom is an Employee)}}, ?X:Employee. \hspace{1cm} // S5
?- deleterule{\text{(?someone with at least 5M is rich)}}. \hspace{1cm} // S6

Each phrase must match one and only one template (matching templates for the above are given below). All details of the syntax of the corresponding template must be followed to the letter: commas, parentheses (cf. S1), letter case, etc. Only variables can be replaced with HiLog terms when templates are used. For instance, as will be seen shortly, in S1 we replaced the variables in the template (T1) with the terms Tom, Student, and Employee, respectively. The phrases S1, S2, and S4 also illustrate the use of special features, like parentheses, commas, slashes, etc., which might be desirable for readability and other purposes.

Needless to say that the template text must be clear, unambiguous, and easily understood in order for ErgoText to be useful; achieving these goals is the job of the template designer. Typically, templates are designed for a particular domain (e.g., legal documents) and thus must involve both
a domain expert to supply the template text and semantics and a skilled ERGO user to provide the ERGO translation.

To summarize, ErgoText phrases are NL phrases that can be mixed with ERGO syntax, such as terms, variables, etc. These phrases must be bound to ERGO statements using template definitions (see below). These definitions are kept in separate template definition files (with the extension .ergotxt) and these files must be either declared or loaded (with the \texttt{ergotext\{\ldots\}} directive) before compiling the ERGO knowledge bases that contain the ErgoText phrases in question. These phrases can also be used in the ERGO shell, provided that the corresponding template definition file is loaded beforehand—again using an appropriate \texttt{ergotext\{\ldots\}} directive.

### 49.2 ErgoText Template Definitions

ErgoText template definitions are supposed to be stored in files with the extension .ergotxt. Each template definition has the form

\[
\text{template}(\text{Context}, \text{ErgoText phrase}, \text{Ergo translation})
\]

\textit{ErgoText phrases} were described in the previous subsection. The \textit{Ergo translation} is an Ergo formula into which the phrase in the second argument is to be translated. What is allowed as such translations depends on the context specified as the first argument. The \texttt{Context} argument is one of the following reserved keywords (they are reserved only in the template definitions, not in general):

- head, body, headbody
- insert, delete, insdel
- dynrule

Why is context needed? The problem is that the same ERGO formula may need to be compiled differently depending on where it occurs: rule head, rule body, in an insert or delete statement, etc. Some syntax may be allowed, say, in the rule body and insert/delete statements (e.g., \texttt{@module}) but not in rule heads; rule Ids and tags can occur only in facts and rules, but not in rule bodies; delete statements allow syntax that is not allowed in insert statements, and so on. Thus, the \texttt{head} context means that the corresponding template is allowed in rule heads (and facts), but not in rule bodies (e.g., S3 above). The \texttt{body} context means the template is suitable only for rule bodies (also S3). Since often the same template might be allowable in both contexts, a combined \texttt{headbody} context is provided for convenience (e.g., for S1 above). The \texttt{insert} and \texttt{delete} contexts are provided for the templates that are meant to be used inside the \texttt{insert\{\ldots\}} and \texttt{delete\{\ldots\}} statements,
respectively (cf., S5). Some formulas may be suitable for both of these update commands and also for rule heads and bodies. An all-encompassing context insdel, which subsumes all four of the aforesaid contexts, is provided for this kind of formulas, for convenience. Finally, dynrule is a context for formulas that are meant to appear inside insertrule{...} and deleterule{...} statements (as in S6 above).

Apart from the above contexts, there are, of course, rules (outside of insertrule{...} and deleterule{...}), like S2 above, queries as in S4, and latent queries (not shown). The context for these is “anything else” and any keyword other than the above reserved ones can be used for them. It is a good practice to use rule, fact, query, and latentquery in these cases, for documentation purposes (so that you will be able to recognize and easily understand the purpose of the corresponding templates). Internally, these latter contexts are represented by the keyword toplevel, and this is what is shown by various debugging primitives described in Section 49.5.

Here are examples of template definitions that are suitable for the above knowledge base (S1-S6) to be placed in mytemplates.ergotxt:

```ergotxt
template(headbody, // headbody is reserved context (T1) (?X is not only a ?Y, but also a (salaried) ?Z\), (?X:{?Y,?Z})).
template(rule, // rule is not a reserved context keyword (T2) (If ?P has ?Thing and paid for it then s/he likes it\), (?P[likes->?Thing] :- ?P[{has,paidfor}->?Thing])).
template(head, // reserved context, used for documentation (T3) (?X cares for ?Y\), ?X[caresfor->?Y]).
template(body, // reserved context keyword (T4) (?X has ?Y\), ?X[has->?Y]).
template(query, // not reserved: query is used for documentation (T5) (insert rule: if ?X has more than 5M then he is rich\), (- insertrule{"X:rich :- ?X[networth->?W], ?W>50000000]})).
template(insdel, // reserved for insert{...}/delete{...} (T6) (?X is an ?Y\), ?X:?Y).
template(dynrule, // reserved (T7) (?someone with at least 5M is rich\), (?someone:rich :- ?someone[networth->?W], ?W>50000000))
```

The reader may have noticed that the \textsc{Ergo} side of the above definitions (argument 3) is sometimes enclosed in parentheses, as in (T1), (T2), (T5), and (T7). This is needed in cases when the definitions contain infix operators, like \texttt{?-, \texttt{:-}}, \texttt{<=}, and the like, which bind its arguments weaker than the comma (or when the definitions contain commas, colons, as in (T1), or other operators, like semicolons). In these cases, the templates might not parse without the aforesaid parentheses.
Note that template definitions can be arbitrarily complex as long as they fit the declared context. For instance,

\[
\text{template(fact,} \\
\hspace{1cm} (\text{Every state has a senator}), \\
\hspace{1cm} (\forall ?\text{State} \exists ?\text{Sen} \text{senator}(?\text{State}, ?\text{Sen}) \iff ?\text{State}: ?\text{State})\]
\]

In case one wants to create a template for rules or facts with descriptors, such as rule IDs, tags, and the like, keep in mind that rule descriptor constructs like \@{...} and \@!{...} are not permitted in ErgoText phrases. Instead, one should just use NL and whatever symbols are allowed to stick in the variables for rule IDs and tags. For instance, a template definition that defines a rule with descriptors could look like this:

\[
\text{template(rule,} \\
\hspace{1.5cm} (\text{Here is a rule with Id=?I and Tag=?T: If it rains, it pours}), \\
\hspace{1.5cm} (@!{?I} @{?T} \text{pours(?X)} :- \text{rains(?X)}))\).
\]

One can then construct a concrete ERGO rule via the following ErgoText phrase:

\[
(\text{Here is a rule with Id=badweather & Tag = watchout: If it rains, it pours})\).
\]

### 49.3 ErgoText Queries and Command Line

So far we have been talking about ErgoText statements that appear in files. What if we want to ask an ErgoText query using the ERGO shell, i.e., on command line (in a terminal, the Studio Listener, or the Studio Query tool)? Just as with file-based ErgoText, one must tell the command line processor which templates to use. There are two ways to do that.

The most common and convenient way to import a template definition file into the ERGO shell is to load or add a file that contain the directive :- ergotext{...}. The template specified in that directive will be then imported into the module to which the file was loaded or added. For instance, if a file, say example.ergo is loaded into the module main and contains a directive of the form :- ergotext{‘some/place/templ’} then one can issue a query like

?- \(\text{my ?H template}\).

in the ERGO shell (assuming such a template exists in some/place/templ.ergotxt). If example.ergo is loaded into the module foo then

?- \(\text{my ?H template}\)@foo.
can be used as a command line query.

The other method is to load a template definition file explicitly. This can be used if the first method cannot be used for some reason. In Section 49.1, we already mentioned that ErgoText template definition files can be loaded at runtime by executing the query

```prolog
?- ergotext{mytemplates}.
```

where `mytemplates.ergotxt` is a suitable template file. To load a template definition file into a module other than `main`, a two-argument directive can be used. For instance,

```prolog
?- ergotext{mytemplates,foobar}.
```

### 49.4 ErgoText and ERGO Modules

ErgoText understands ERGO modules, so the expressions like

```prolog
p(?H) :- \\my ?H template\\@foo.
```

are understood subject to the following:

1. A compiler directive

```prolog
:- ergotext{mytemplate,foo}.
```

must appear at the top of the file containing a phrase like \\
`my ?H template\\@foo` above and the template definition file `mytemplate.ergotxt` must exist and be locatable, i.e., it must either be an absolute path name (not recommended) or a name relative to the directory of the containing file.

2. The module specification must be a constant; a variable or a quasi-constant like `\@` will cause the compiler to issue an error. That is, something like the following

```prolog
?- ?Mod = foo, \\my ?H template\\@?Mod.
?- \\my ?H template\\@\\@.
```

are not allowed.
49.5 Debugging ErgoText Templates

ErgoText makes many syntactic checks to verify the templates are syntactically correct and otherwise make sense. It also checks that there is no *ambiguity* among templates; that is, that templates with *overlapping* contexts have disjoint template phrases.

Two contexts overlap if their phrases can be used in the same syntactic position in ErgoText statements. Clearly, identical contexts (like `body/body` or `head/head`) overlap. In addition, `headbody` is a shorthand for a set of contexts `body`, `head`, and `toplevel`. The context `head` actually also includes `toplevel`, while `insdel` includes `body`, `head`, `insert`, `delete`, and `toplevel`. So, `head` overlaps with `insdel` and `toplevel`, while `insdel` overlaps with `body`, `head`, and others. Two templates are *disjoint* if they cannot match the same ErgoText phrase; in other words, if they do not unify.

Besides the checks, ErgoText provides several primitives to help the template designer to debug the templates before releasing them to the end user. The most typical problem is when an ErgoText phrase *seems* to match a template, but it does not and the compiler issues an error claiming that no template definition matches the phrase. To better see the problem, consider the following template:

```
```

and a query

```
?- (Is p:q true?).
```

Intuitively, one might think that this should be translated into the query `?- p:q`, but it does not. The reason is that ErgoText’s syntax is rich with infix operators, like `::`, `->`, comma, etc. These operators have precedence values that indicate which operator binds tighter. The magic of the operator grammars combines the above text into regular terms of the form `functor(argument_list)`. Since the details of that algorithm are complicated and one cannot and does not want to consult the table of precedence values, it is sometimes hard to see how a phrase, like the above, will be parsed. The bottom line here is that the above query will *not* match the template—to much surprise and chagrin of the template developer and the user. To help debug such cases, ErgoText provides a parser API call `show_ergotext_phrase_as_term/1`, which can be used as follows:

```
?- show_ergotext_phrase_as_term((Is p:q true?)).

ErgoText phrase parsed form:
   [Is, p : (q, (true, ?))]
```

This means that the above ErgoText query gets parsed as a list of two terms the second of which is `p: (q, (true, ?))`. Asking the same question about the template phrase, we get:
?- show_ergotext_phrase_as_term((Is ?X true?)@prolog(flrparser)).
ErgoText phrase parsed form:
   [Is, ?X, true, ?]

which is quite different. In such a situation, one can force the parser do the needful by placing commas in strategic places. For instance,

?- show_ergotext_phrase_as_term((Is, p:q, true?)@prolog(flrparser)).
ErgoText phrase parsed form:
   [Is, p : q, true, ?]

yields the same parse as the phrase in the template, and one can verify that the above ErgoText phrase will now match the template.

To list all the active templates (i.e., templates that are currently affecting the parser), \texttt{E}RGO’s parser provides \texttt{ergo\_show\_active\_templates/0}. The following example shows a use of that call along with some of the results it produces.

?- ergo\_show\_active\_templates@prolog(flrparser).
Active ErgoText templates:

Template context: body
Template phrase: ?A is not only a ?B but also a (salaried) ?C
Template definition: ?A : {?B, ?C}

Template context: head
Template phrase: ?A cares for ?B
Template definition: ?A[caresfor-> {?B}]

Template context: body
Template phrase: ?A has ?B
Template definition: ?A[has-> {?B}]

Template context: delete
Template phrase: ?A is an ?B

If one wants to see templates that are \textit{not} currently loaded (active), the API call \texttt{ergo\_show\_templates/1} will do it:

?- ergo\_show\_templates(template3)@prolog(flrparser).
The output is similar to `ergo_show_active_templates/0`.

Given an ErgoText phrase, one might want to see the templates that match it. This is done via the calls `ergo_show_matching_templates/2` and `ergo_show_active_matching_templates/2`. The difference between these calls is that the latter matches against the active templates that are in effect in the `module` specified in the second argument, while the former takes the template file argument explicitly. For instance,

```prolog
?- ergo_show_matching_templates((Is,p:q,true?),template3)@plg(flrparser).
Context: body
Definition: p : q
```
or

```prolog
?- ergo_show_active_matching_templates((Is,p:q,true?),main)@plg(flrparser).
```

The latter produces similar output but it contains the matches against the templates currently active in module `main`. The context part in the above listing is either one of the reserved keywords `body`, `head`, `insert`, `delete`, or `dynrule`, or it is `toplevel`. The latter corresponds to all other contexts, i.e., rule, query, latent query, or fact (facts can match either `head` context or `toplevel`).

### 49.6 ErgoText and Error Reporting

ErgoText templates present a number of challenges when it comes to error reporting, and the template designer must be aware of the possible pitfalls. One such pitfall has to do with templates that obscure so much of the underlying ERGO formulas that it is hard for the end user to understand the reasons for various errors and warnings. To illustrate, consider the following buggy template:

```prolog
template(body,(test),\(\neg insert\{foobar\}\)).
```

Here explicit negation is applied to the insert operator, which is an error. The problem is that the template compiler uses a shallow parser, which does not catch all the errors and leaves further error detection to a later stage. As a result, the above template would be compiled without any errors or warnings. The error (“illegal use of explicit negation”) will be reported only when the template will be actually used at compile or run time:

```prolog
:- ergotext{mytemplates}.
?- \(\{test\}\).
```
Although the error will point to the line number where the above ErgoText phrase was used, the template designer (who failed to debug his templates) — and certainly the end user — will find it difficult to understand what is going on because the template phrase provides no hint regarding the underlying ERGO statement.

For another example, consider the template

```
template(head,\(test\),p(b)).
```

and the knowledge base

```
:- ergotext\{mytemplates\}.
f(p(a)).
\(test\).
```

Although this is not a mistake, it is suspicious: the symbol \texttt{p/1} is used in two different ways here—once explicitly, as a HiLog function symbol, and once implicitly, as a predicate symbol (in the template). ERGO will issue a warning about the ambiguous use of \texttt{p/1} (see Section 26), but the end user will likely be at a loss as to why.

The lesson of these examples is that ErgoText templates must be designed in a way that the template phrases will have enough information to help the end user resolve the possible issues with errors and warnings reported by ERGO.

### 49.7 ErgoText and Text Generation

\textit{Text generation} refers to the ability to generate textual description of ERGO facts, queries, and rules. Currently text generation is used for generating textual explanations to query answers—see Section 50.

ERGO supports two kinds of text generation: ErgoText-based and a light-weight TextIt facility, described in Section 50.3. As far as ErgoText-based text generation is concerned, it is triggered whenever a subgoal is chosen as an explanation and that subgoal matches the definitional part in an ErgoText template. In that case, the NL phrase in the template will be shown as an explanation instead of the subgoal. Only the templates of type \texttt{body} (and, by implication, \texttt{headbody} and \texttt{insdel}) are used for text generation. Thus, if you want to exclude a certain template from being used for text generation, use an ErgoText context other than the above three. For instance, \texttt{rulehead}, \texttt{rulebody}, or some other easily recognizable keyword.

Text generation via ErgoText and TextIt can be used together. If a subgoal matches both an ErgoText template and a TextIt template, the latter will be shown as an explanation. If only one kind of a template (ErgoText or TextIt) matches the subgoal, the text generated from that template will be used.
50 Explaining Answers

When Ergo runs as an Ergo Studio application, the user can request explanations for the answers either by running a query using the Query Tool or on command line, through the Studio Listener. In addition, explanations can be obtained programatically, via the explanation API. This latter method is available both in and outside of the studio; it is suitable for applications developers who need to add an explanation capability to their software (such as a chatbot).

We should note that, at present, explanations can be obtained only for queries that can be replayed. These are the queries that leave the underlying state of the knowledge base intact. This includes the queries that do not involve update operators or the queries in which

1. all update operators are transactional (tinsert, tdelete, etc.) and
2. all such update operators occur in the scope of a hypothetical operator <> or ~<>.

50.1 Obtaining Explanations via the Studio

In case of the Ergo Studio, explanations can be requested by double-clicking on any particular answer (or by choosing an appropriate menu item—Why? or Why not?). Alternatively, the user may request explanations by typing the query

\texttt{why\{Goal\}.}

in the Studio Listener. In both cases, a window pops up, which explains how answers were obtained or why they were not obtained. Statements marked in green in the explanation window are proved to be true, those displayed in the blue color are false. Red means contradiction (both \(p\) and \(\neg p\) can be proved), and purple means undefined (neither \(p\) nor \(\naf p\) can be proven). Finally, the brown color denotes facts that should have been true, but were defeated.

Non-ground justifications. \textit{Goal} is expected to be ground (no variables) because this facility is intended to explain why a particular answer was or was not derived. If it is not ground, the goal will be instantiated to the first derivable answer and that particular answer will be explained. For instance, if \texttt{grandchild(May,Bob)} and \texttt{grandchild(Bill,Sue)} are both true then \texttt{why\{grandchild(?X,?Y)\}} will match \(?X\) and \(?Y\) against one of the above answers nondeterministically (e.g., \(?X=Bill\) and \(?X=Sue\)) and only \texttt{grandchild(Bill,Sue)} will be explained. However, there is an easy way to get all justifications for all answers at once. All one has to do is to pose this as a query:

\texttt{grandchild(?X,?Y), why\{grandchild(?X,?Y)\}.}
What this does is it obtains one answer at a time, binding ?X and ?Y and making grandchild(?X,?Y) ground, and then explanation is obtained for each of these groundings. Each explanation will appear in a separate tab in the explanation window and so it should be clear that doing this for queries that have many answers is not advisable.

**Explanations and text generation.** Explanations can be combined with the ErgoText feature, described in Section 49, to generate textual explanations (e.g., in English) instead of the more technical ERGO's logic syntax. This feature is described in Section 49.7 and is called *text generation*. A way to do this is to create English sentence templates for the subgoals that one desires to appear in explanations as English sentences. See Section 49.7 for more details. Another, complementary way of generating textual explanations is TextIt, described in Section 50.3. It is a lighter-weight facility, which can be used together with ErgoText or by itself.

### 50.2 Obtaining Explanations via the ERGO Programmatic API

Developers can add explanation capability to their applications via the *Explanation API*, which provides high-level calls for obtaining explanations *all-at-once* or *step-by-step*. Most users would choose the all-at-once method, since it is much easier. The step-by-step method is suitable for very advanced users who need their apps to provide heavily customized explanations in cases when the all-at-once API falls short for some reason. Another situation where the step-by-step method may be better is when full explanations contain millions of items (for instance, when rules involve many aggregate functions that aggregate tens of thousands of values). In such a case, generating a full explanation may take significant amount of time and space.

#### 50.2.1 Obtaining Explanations All-at-once

This portion of the API provides calls that take a goal to explain and return a structure that represents a complete explanation of why that goal was or was not derived. The following API calls are provided—all in the system module \( \texttt{\why} \):

- \( \texttt{\Goal[why(full) -> Explanation]@\why} \)

This is the most common call in this API. \( \texttt{\Goal} \) must be instantiated to a reified subgoal to be explained. It is expected to be ground (variables must be substituted with constants or other ground terms). If it is not, \( \texttt{\Goal} \) will be matched against the first-found matching ground answer and this will be the answer that will be explained. An explanation for a goal shows one of the possible derivations of that goal given the rules and facts that were provided to ERGO. The derivation will be aware of F-logic inheritance, background axioms (e.g., the transitivity of \( :; :=;) \), and defeasibility. If \( \texttt{\Goal} \) is false, the explanation will show some of the reasons...
why this might be so. In general, the number of reasons for why a particular answer was not derived can be huge, so ERGO just tries to give some “reasonable” explanations. If the truth value of "Goal" is undefined, it is usually either due to a negative loop through negation (which will be demonstrated) or because at some point \texttt{naf} was applied to a non-ground subgoal some of whose instances are true and some false (or undefined). If "Goal" is contradictory, i.e., both it and its negation can be derived, both derivations will be shown. Note that ERGO is based on a paraconsistent logic, so a contradiction is always localized to specific subgoals and this does not destroy the knowledge base, unlike in classical logic.

The result of the above query, "Explanation", is a recursive data structure consisting of explanation snippets of the form

\[
\text{explanation(TruthValue(Goal,Reason,RuleInfo),SupportList)}
\]

where

- \textit{TruthValue} can be \texttt{true}, \texttt{false}, \texttt{undefined}, or \texttt{contradiction}, depending on the truth value of \textit{Goal}.

- \textit{Reason} is a text string that provides an explanation for the reason why \textit{Goal} appears in that explanation snippet. For the top goal, that reason is ‘top query’, but usually it is just \texttt{null} because in most cases snippets appear in explanations because they occur in the bodies of rules used in the derivation. When they are not \texttt{null}, it is usually because the snippet \textit{defeats} the subgoal \textit{G}' that it is supposed to explain (in this case, \textit{G}' would be false or undefined and the reason would be \texttt{refutedBy}, \texttt{rebuttedBy}, etc.—see Section 40 for a refresher on the concepts of defeasible reasoning) or because the aforesaid subgoal \textit{G}' was inherited from \textit{Goal} (in which case the reason will describe the type of inheritance used, i.e., inheritance of type, value, etc.).

- \textit{RuleInfo} provides information about the rule that was used to derive \textit{Goal}. It has the form \texttt{ruleid(LocalId,File,Module)} and supplies the three components that constitute an Id of a rule in ERGO. The meaning of these items is explained in Section 36. If the rule cannot be determined or is inapplicable (for instance, if \textit{Goal} is composite, is an aggregate function, or was concluded by an axiom such as the transitivity of ::) then \textit{LocalId} is \texttt{null} (and \textit{File/Module} may or may not be \texttt{null}).

- \textit{SupportList} is a list of explanation snippets that explain how \textit{Goal} got its \textit{TruthValue}. That is, the members of the list are snippets of the above form, which makes the explanation structure recursive. If no support is required for \textit{Goal}, \textit{SupportList} would be an empty list. This happens when \textit{Goal} is a base fact or there is a rule like \textit{Goal} : \texttt{¬\textbackslash true.}, a builtin that evaluates to true, or a statement that has no matching rules.

In general, an explanation structure is rather long, so we will give just a small number of simple examples:
Observe that in some cases (in bold) the explanation includes the identification information for the rules involved in the inference, which can be used to get to those rules via the clause{...} and the @!{...} queries. In other cases, the rule information does not exist because the conclusions were made by relying of base facts.

Next is an example that involves defeasibility in which the fact q is refuted by p, making q false while leaving p true.

// demo2.ergo
use_argumentation_theory.
@{high} p :- r,s.
@{low} q.
\opposes(p,q).
\overrides(high,low).
r,s.

?- $\{q\}[why(full)]->?E@\why.
?E=explanation(false($\{q@main\},'top query',ruleid(null,null,main)),
[explanation(true($\{p@main\}',ruleid(4,'demo2.ergo',main)),
[explanation(true($\{p@main\}',true($\{p@main\}',ruleid(null,null,main))),[]),
explanation(true($\{p@main\}',true($\{p@main\}',ruleid(null,null,main))),[])),
explanation(true($\{p@main\}',true($\{p@main\}',ruleid(null,null,main))),[])),
explanation(true($\{p@main\}',true($\{p@main\}',ruleid(null,null,main))),[])),
explanation(true($\{p@main\}',true($\{p@main\}',ruleid(null,null,main))),[])),
explanation(true($\{p@main\}',true($\{p@main\}',ruleid(null,null,main))),[])),
explanation(true($\{p@main\}',true($\{p@main\}',ruleid(null,null,main))),[])),
explanation(true($\{p@main\}',true($\{p@main\}',ruleid(null,null,main))),[]))

Again, in two cases where inference was made via a rule, the rule information was provided. In other cases, the statements were base facts (in which case rule information is inapplicable) or inference was made via a defeasibility axiom, which is indicated via \texttt{refutedBy} and \texttt{rebuttedBy} clauses.

The following is an example of an explanation that involves inheritance of type by method specialization:

```ergo
// demo3.ergo
employee[|salary(year)=>\integer|].
2017:year.
Bob:employee.

?SalaryType = \integer
?E = explanation(true(\{Bob[salary(2017)=>\integer@main\},'top query',
ruleid(null,null,main)),
[explanation(true(\{Bob:employee@main\},'base fact',
ruleid(null,null,main)),[]),
explanation(true(\{employee[|salary(2017)=>\integer|]@main\},null,
ruleid(null,null,main)),
[explanation(true('method salary(year) is a generalization of salary(2017)' ,
null,
ruleid(null,null,main)),[]),
explanation(true(\{employee[|salary(year)=>\integer|]@main\},
'base fact',
ruleid(null,null,main)),[]))])]
```

Note that the explanation indicates how inheritance was used in the inference. Since no rules were used in this inference, the \texttt{ruleid(...)} part is null. Finally, we show an example of behavioral inheritance:

```ergo
// demo4.ergo
employee[|vacationdays->20|].
\{Mary,Bob\}:employee.
Mary[vacationdays->25].

```
?V = 20
?E = explanation(true(${Bob[vacationdays->20]@main},'top query',ruleid(null,null,main)),
    [explanation(true(${Bob:employee@main},'base fact',
        ruleid(null,null,null)),[]),
    explanation(true(${employee[vacationdays->20]@main},'base fact',
        ruleid(null,null,null)),[]))

?V = 25
?E = explanation(true(${Mary[vacationdays->25]@main},'top query',ruleid(null,null,main)),
    [explanation(true(${Mary[vacationdays->25]@main},'base fact',
        ruleid(null,null,null)),[]])

As in the previous example, all inference is done without the use of rules so that part of the explanation is null. Note, on the other hand, how the first explanation shows the inheritance of vacation days from the class employee in case of Bob and that the second explanation shows that inheritance is not used in case of Mary because her information about vacation days is explicit and overrides what is inherited from her superclass.


This call may be useful in case ErgoText and/or textit... are is being used for all or some of the logic in the application. The description of this call is the same as above with the only difference being that the truth-value component in an explanation snippet has the form

\[TruthValue(Goal, Reason, GoalText, RuleInfo)\]

where GoalText is a textual representation of Goal. If Goal has an ErgoText template (or a textit template) then GoalText is the ErgoText phrase corresponding to Goal in that template. If no ErgoText/textit template for Goal exists, GoalText is simply a string that corresponds to the textual appearance of Goal (like what one sees when query answers are shown).

The RuleInfo part in this case has the form

\[ruleinfo(ruleid(LocalId,File,Module), RuleText)\]

Here RuleText could be one of these:

- If Goal was inferred by a rule and that rule had a textit attribute in its descriptor (see Section 36 about rule descriptors) as in

\[@!{rule123[textit->'If a & b is true then c is also!'\}]

\[c :- a, b.\]

then RuleText is what that attribute gives (’If a & b is true then c is also!’ in this example).
– If Goal was derived by a rule but textit was not specified in that rule’s descriptor then RuleText is omitted.

– If Goal is inferred via an axiom and not a rule then this axiom’s text is used, prefixed with axiom|. (See an example below.)

– If Goal is a base fact or a builtin (including aggregate functions) and none of the above applies, then RuleText is base_or_builtin.

– RuleText is inapplicable if the goal cannot be derived via a single rule (composite goal).

– Otherwise, RuleText is indeterminable. This usually happens if Goal was derived by a rule that has only builtins or Prolog predicates. It also can happen to subgoals used in computing aggregates and in defeasible reasoning.

For instance, in example demo3.ergo above, we would get the following:

```
// demo3.ergo with text
employee[|salary(year)=>\integer|].
2017:year.
Bob:employee.

?SalaryType=\integer
?E=explanation(true(${Bob[salary(2017)=>\integer]@main},'top query',
                  'Bob[salary(2017)=>\integer]',
                  ruleinfo(ruleid(null,null,main),
                            'axiom|inheritance of type to class member'),
               [explanation(true(${Bob:employee@main},'base fact',
                              'Bob:employee',
                              ruleinfo(ruleid(null,null,null),base_or_builtin)),[]),
                explanation(true(${employee[|salary(2017)=>\integer|]@main},null,
                                  'employee[|salary(2017)=>\integer|]',
                                  ruleinfo(ruleid(null,null,main),
                                            'axiom|inheritance by method specialization'),
               [explanation(true('method salary(year) is a generalization of salary(2017)',
                                 null,
                                 'method salary(year) is a generalization of salary(2017)',
                                 ruleinfo(ruleid(null,null,null),base_or_builtin)),[]),
                explanation(true(${employee[|salary(year)=>\integer|]@main},'base fact',
                                 'employee[|salary(year)=>\integer|]',
                                 ruleinfo(ruleid(null,null,null),base_or_builtin)),[])]]
```


Sometimes one needs only the textual information from explanations—not the actual subgoal
or a reason. In this case, this call would be most effective. It is like the \texttt{withtext} call except that only the \texttt{GoalText} part is returned:

\[
\text{TruthValue}(\text{GoalText}, \text{RuleInfo})
\]

where \texttt{GoalText} is as above. \texttt{RuleInfo} in this case consists of just the \texttt{RuleText} component described above (with the \texttt{withtext} option).

- \texttt{Goal[why(full,raw) -> ?Explanation]@\why}.
  This call is very rarely used as it is lower-level than the calls described above. It is like \texttt{why(full)} except that the elements of the \texttt{?Explanation} structure are \textit{support objects}. One can use the calls in the step-by-step API to get information out of these objects. The structure of an explanation snippet in this case is also similar to the first API call (\texttt{why(full)}) except that the truth-value portion of the snippet is as follows:
  - In the very top snippet, the truth-value portion is the same as in the first API call: \texttt{TruthValue(\text{Goal,'top query'}).}
  - In all subsequent snippets, this element is an aforesaid support object. A support object is a 6-ary HiLog term. The step-by-step API, described next, lets one extract the various components out of these structures.

- \texttt{?Explanation[size -> ?number]@\why}.
  Sometimes it is useful to know how large is a full explanation. Since an explanation is a complex recursive structure, getting the size information out is a chore. This API call does it.

\subsection{50.2.2 Obtaining Explanations Step-by-step}

As mentioned previously, this API is mostly for do-it-yourselfers who need heavily customized explanation mechanisms.

- \texttt{?Goal[why -> ?SupportObject]@\why}.
  This call takes a reified goal and returns the support objects that can be used to prove that goal. This is always a top-level call. Subsequently, the \texttt{support} attribute can be used to drill further down into the explanations.

- \texttt{?SupportObject[support -> ?ChildSupportObject]@\why}.
  This call can be used to deepen the exploration of the derivation tree for a query answer.

- \texttt{?SupportObject[isleaf]@\why}.
  This call tells if a support object is a \textit{leaf}, in which case no further deepening is necessary.
   Returns the goal encapsulated inside ?SupportObject.

   Returns the special reason for this derivation step; encapsulated inside ?SupportObject.

   Converts the goal encapsulated within ?SupportObject into its textual representation. If an
   ErgoText template that corresponds to that goal exists, then the English phrase from that
   template is used. Otherwise, the goal is just converted to its string representation.

• ?SupportObject[rule -> ruleid(?LocalId,?File,?Module)]@why.
   Returns the Id of the rule in which this support object’s goal was used as a condition in the
   body.

   Extracts the truth-value/reason information from the ?SupportObject structure. It has the
   form that is already familiar to us from the first API call: TruthValue(Goal,Reason).

50.2.3 Explanations for Non-ground Queries

The explanation API expects that the subgoals that are to be explained are ground. If not, ERGO
finds one of the answers non-deterministically and explains just that one answer. If a query is non-
ground, can we make ERGO to return explanations for all answers to the query without tediously
feeding the answers one-by-one and asking many separate queries? This is actually quite easy. For
a non-ground query one can simply pose the following as a query (change full to the arguments
appropriate for your sitation; e.g., full,textonly):

```prolog
query, ${query}[why(full)->?Explanation]@why.
```

or like this, which can be shorter if query is a long sentence:

```prolog
```

That is, first call query and then ask for the explanations for whatever answers were found. Both
must be done in the same query or rule body. For instance,

```prolog
:- compiler_options{omni=on}.
exist(?Sen1,?Sen2)^senator(?State,{?Sen1,?Sen2}) :- state(?State).
state(NY).
state(AL).
```
state(TX).
?- senator(?State,_Senator),
{senator(?State,_Senator)}[why(full)->?Explanation]@\why.

will return three answers, each containing an explanation for a particular binding NY, AL, and TX for ?State:

?-State = NY
?Explanation = explanation(true({senator(NY,...

?-State = TX
?Explanation = explanation(true({senator(TX,...

Try it!.

50.3 Text Generation for Explanations via TextIt

In Section 49.7 we discussed the use of ErgoText templates for text generation for the answer explanation process. However, when ErgoText is not used, one might still want explanations to appear in a textual form rather than in a logical form (for instance, for showing to domain experts). TextIt is a simplified facility for that. The general form of a TextIt template is

```
{Subgoal,FormatString,ArgList}
```

(Note the curly braces.) Subgoal here is a subgoal for which one wants to generate text. It does not need to be reified, since ERGO knows that this is supposed to be a formula and will reify it automatically. FormatString is a Prolog atom where markers of the form %s have special meaning: they are substituted by the arguments from ArgList in the order of appearance. That ArgList is usually the list of variables from Subgoal but can also contain other terms. The number of %s’s in FormatString must equal the length of the list ArgList. If not, an error or a warning will be issued.

(To avoid confusion, we should mention that the TextIt facility described here is distinct from the textit attribute in rule descriptors introduced earlier, on page 319, in conjunction with the withtext option. Both facilities are used to provide textual explanations for ERGO inferences: the former for subgoals and the latter for rules.)

TextIt templates can be made known to ERGO as facts as in
textit{Subgoal1, FormatString1, ArgList1}.

textit{Subgoal2, ..., ...}.

...

textit{SubgoalN, ..., ...}.

or via queries like this:

?- textit{Subgoal1, FormatString1, ArgList1},
   textit{Subgoal2, ..., ...},
   ...
   textit{SubgoalN, ..., ...}.

For instance,

  textit{address(?P,?A), '%s lives at %s', [?P,?A]}.
  ?- textit{foo(?X), 'this is foo of %s %s', [the,?X]},
     textit{salary(?P,?S), '%s has salary %s', [?P,?S]}.

If subgoal foo(bar) occurs in an explanation, it will be shown as the sentence this is foo of the bar. If salary(John,100000) appears in an explanation, it will be shown as John has salary 100000. Similarly, address(Bob,'1 Main St.') will be shown as Bob lives at 1 Main St. For instance,

  ergo> textit{salary(?P,?S),'%s has salary %s', [?P,?S]}.
  ...  
  ergo> insert{salary(John,100000)}.
  ...
  ergo> ${salary(John,?)}[why(full,textonly)->?E]@\why.
  ?E = explanation(true('John has salary 100000'),
               [explanation(true('John has salary 100000'),[])])

or

  ergo> ${salary(John,?)}[why(full,withtext)->?E]@\why.
  ?E = explanation(true('${salary(John,100000)@main},
       'top query',
       'John has salary 100000'),
       [explanation(true('${salary(John,100000)@main},
             'base fact',
             'John has salary 100000'),[])])
The choice of whether queries or facts should be used depends on the situation. Facts are imported faster, so if there is a very large number of TextIt templates then one should use that method. On the other hand, the query method is more flexible, as it lets one apply templates conditionally and even construct them on the fly. For instance, in

?- db_pred(?P), db_word(?W), textit{?P(?X), ’this is %s of %s %s’, [?P,?W,?X]}.  

if ?P gets bound to test and ?W to my then the following template will be recorded by the system:

    textit{test(?X), ’this is %s of %s %s’, [test,my,?X]}.  

The textit primitives can appear even in rule bodies!

We remind from Section 49.7 that text generation via ErgoText and TextIt can be used together. If a subgoal matches both an ErgoText template and a TextIt template, the latter will be shown as an explanation. If only one kind of a template (ErgoText or TextIt) matches the subgoal, the text generated from that template is used.

### 50.4 Fine-tuning the Explanations

Ergo provides certain control over which subgoals will be shown in the explanations via the following two predicates:

\[ \text{\texttt{trivialJustification(type, reified-goal)}} \]
\[ \text{\texttt{opaqueJustification(type, reified-goal)}} \]

where \texttt{type} can be \texttt{w}, \texttt{m}, or a variable (usually just \texttt{?}).

If a subgoal appears in \texttt{trivialJustification} then neither it nor its subtree (if it depends on other subgoals) will show up in explanations. If the subgoal is mentioned in \texttt{opaqueJustification} then it will appear in explanations, but its subtree will not. More precisely, the above statements are true only if the aforesaid \texttt{type} is a variable. If \texttt{type} is \texttt{w} then the aforesaid explanations will be omitted only if \texttt{reified-goal} is true or undefined. If \texttt{type} is \texttt{m} then they will be omitted only if \texttt{reified-goal} is false. Here are some examples:

\texttt{\texttt{trivialJustification(?,$\{p(?)\}$. // omit p(?) and subtree  
\texttt{\texttt{trivialJustification(w,$\{q(?,?,?)\}$. // omit q(?,?,?) & subtree if q(?,?,?) is true  
\texttt{\texttt{trivialJustification(m,$\{r(?)@\texttt{foo}\}$. // omit r(?)@\texttt{foo} only if r(?) is false  
\texttt{\texttt{trivialJustification(?,$\{?@\texttt{foo}\}$. // omit everything in module \texttt{foo}
51 Unicode and Character Encodings

If all your applications deal only with ASCII characters, like the ones found on an English keyboard, you can safely skip this section. Otherwise, if you are dealing with alphabets other than English (even if it is just one of the European languages based on Latin alphabet) then read on.

51.1 What Is a Character Encoding?

Data (including programs, databases, and knowledge bases) is represented as sequences of characters, where each character is encoded as a sequence of bits. All these bits are useless, however, unless one knows what character each particular subsequence represents. The mapping between bit sequences and characters is known as a code table. The best-known coding table is ASCII, and it assigns a number between 0 and 127 to various characters found on English keyboards, including digits, lower- and uppercase letters, and punctuation.

Unfortunately, ASCII encodes too few characters and various groups took initiative to define bigger code tables, typically appropriating the characters in the 128 – 255 range for various national alphabets. One of the best-known such tables is Latin-1, which encodes all special accented letters in Latin-based alphabets. But these extra 128 symbols are too few to accommodate other alphabets, like Russian, Greek, Hebrew, etc. As a result, many more coding tables sprang up—all appropriating the same characters from the range 128 – 255 for the different alphabets, and this is where many problems originate. Data could now come in any of the dozens of different encodings and, unless one knows which encoding was used, that data is all but useless. On top of all this, Far-Eastern languages need so many characters for writing that they require different kinds of coding tables all together.

To bring some order into this business, Unicode Consortium was created and tasked to come up with one coding table that is capable of encoding all existing alphabets and common characters, including many mathematical characters, currency symbols, and then some. This eventually led to the Unicode standard known as UTF-8, which is a coding table that represents all known characters using sequences of one to four bytes. Thus, ASCII characters are represented using one byte, Latin-1 (and much more) using two bytes, etc. This picture is complicated by the fact that Unicode Consortium did not come to UTF-8 right away, but through a series of less successful standards, like UTF-16 and UTF-32, which are still around and make things more complicated.
51.2 Character Encodings in \texttt{E}RGO

With all this multitude of encodings, \texttt{E}RGO supports only the three most common ones: UTF-8, CP1252, and Latin-1. Since these three (and, in fact, all coding systems) subsume and agree on the ASCII character set, the latter is, of course, also supported.

CP1252 is very similar to Latin-1 in its intent and their encodings agree everywhere except for about two dozen of symbols in the 128 – 159 range. The only reason why CP1252 is supported by \texttt{E}RGO is that it happens to be the default on Windows and much of the data produced on that platform still tends to be encoded using the CP1252 coding table.

51.3 Specifying Encodings in \texttt{E}RGO

To specify the encoding to use in processing programs or data, \texttt{E}RGO provides one compiler directive and one executable directive as follows:

\begin{verbatim}
:- encoding{enc_name}. // compiler directive
?- encoding{enc_name}. // executable directive
\end{verbatim}

where \texttt{enc\_name} can be one of the following: utf8, latin1, cp1252.

First, if a knowledge base or a data file contains only ASCII characters, the encoding is immaterial and nothing needs to be specified. Otherwise, if one has a ruleset or a set of \texttt{E}RGO facts that contain non-ASCII symbols, then the \textit{compiler directive \texttt{encoding}} should be used at the top of the corresponding file. If a data file that contains non-ASCII characters needs to be read in or written out, the \textit{executable directive \texttt{encoding}} must be executed just before the file is opened (say, using the \texttt{see}, \texttt{tell}, or \texttt{open} operations).

Note that, on Linux and Mac, the default encoding is UTF-8, but on Windows it is CP1252. Therefore, forgetting to place or execute the \texttt{encoding} directive in a non-ASCII situation may result in the same knowledge base being compiled differently or the same file being ingested or written out differently under Linux and Windows.

We also note that the \textit{scope} of the compiler directive \texttt{encoding} is the file in which the directive occurs. After the file is compiled and loaded, the encoding returns to what it was before. On the other hand, the effect of the \textit{executable directive persists until the next \texttt{encoding} directive is executed.}
52 Notes on Style and Common Pitfalls

Knowledge engineering in \textit{\textsc{ergo}} is similar to programming in Prolog, but is more declarative. For one thing, frame literals are always tabled, so the knowledge engineer does not need to worry about tabling the right predicates. Second, there is no need to worry that a predicate must be declared as dynamic in order to be updatable. Third — and most important — the facts specified in the knowledge base are stored in special data structures so that their order does not matter and duplicates are eliminated automatically.

52.1 Facts are Unordered

The fact that \textit{\textsc{ergo}} does not assume any particular order for facts has a far-reaching impact on the knowledge engineering style and is one of the pitfalls that an engineer should avoid. In Prolog, it is a common practice to put the catch-all facts at the end of a program block in order to capture subgoals that do not match the rest of the program clauses. For instance,

\begin{verbatim}
p(f(?X)) :- ...
p(g(?X)) :- ...
%%% If all else fails, simply succeed.  
p(?_).
\end{verbatim}

This idiom is usually used when the “...” contains some procedural statement, like writing on the screen, but it will not work in \textit{\textsc{ergo}}, because \texttt{p(?_)} will be treated as a database fact, which is placed in no particular order with respect to the program. If one wants the same effect in \textit{\textsc{ergo}}, represent the catch-all facts as rules:

\begin{verbatim}
%p(f(?X)) :- ...
%p(g(?X)) :- ...
// If all else fails, simply succeed. Use rule notation for p/1.  
%p(?_):- \true.
\end{verbatim}

Here we added %-sign to \texttt{p} because, as noted above, this kind of an idiom is used when “...” contains some procedural statement.

52.2 Testing for Class Membership

In imperative programming, users specify objects’ properties together with the statements about the class membership of those objects. The same is true in \textit{\textsc{ergo}}. For instance, we would specify an object \texttt{John} as follows, which is conceptually similar to, say, Java:
John : person
[ name->'John Doe',
  address->'123 Main St.',
  hobby->{chess, hiking}
].

However, in E/RGO attributes can also be specified using rules. For instance, we can say that (in our particular enterprise) an employee works in the same building where the employee's department is located:


Our experience in teaching F-logic-based knowledge engineering to users indicates that initially there is a tendency to confuse premises with consequents when it comes to class membership. So, a common mistake is to write the above as


A minute of reflection should convince the reader that this is incorrect, since the above rule is equivalent to two statements:

\[ ?X:employee :- ?X[department->?_[building->?B]]. \]

It is the second statement, which is problematic. Certainly, we did not intend to say that any object with a department attribute pointing to an object with a building attribute is an employee!

It is interesting to note that such a confusion between premises and consequences is common only when it comes to class membership. Therefore, the user should carefully check the validity of placing class membership formulas in rule heads.

52.3 Composite Frames in Rule Heads

Another common mistake is the inappropriate use of complex frames in rule heads. When using a complex frame, such as \( a[b->c, d->e] \), one must always keep in mind that its meaning is \( a[b->c] \) and \( a[d->e] \) whether the frame occurs in a rule head or in its body. Therefore, if \( a[b->c, d->e] \) occurs in the head of a rule like

\[ a[b->c, d->e] :- body. \]
then the rule can be broken in two using the usual logical tautology \((X \land Y) \leftrightarrow Z \equiv (X \leftrightarrow Z) \land (Y \leftrightarrow Z)\):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a}[b->c] & : \text{body}. \\
\text{a}[d->e] & : \text{body}.
\end{align*}
\]

Forgetting this tautology sometimes causes logical mistakes. For instance, suppose \textit{flight} is a binary relation that represents direct flights between cities. Then a rule like this

\[
\text{flightobj}[\text{from}->?F, \text{to}->?T] : \text{flight(?F,?T)}.
\]

is likely to be a mistake if the user simply wanted to convert the relational representation into an object-oriented one. Indeed, in the head, \textit{flightobj} is a \textit{single} object and therefore both \textit{from} and \textit{to} will get multiple values and it will not be possible to find out (by querying that object) which cities have direct flights between them. The easiest way to see this is through the use of the aforesaid tautology:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{flightobj}[\text{from}->?F] & : \text{flight(?F,?T)}. \\
\text{flightobj}[\text{to}->?T] & : \text{flight(?F,?T)}.
\end{align*}
\]

Therefore, if the \textit{flight} relation has the following facts

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{flight(NewYork,Boston)}. \\
\text{flight(Seattle,Toronto)}.
\end{align*}
\]

then the following frames will be derived (where the last two are unintended):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{flightobj}[\text{from}->\text{NewYork}, \text{to}->\text{Boston}]. \\
\text{flightobj}[\text{from}->\text{Seattle}, \text{to}->\text{Toronto}]. \\
\text{flightobj}[\text{from}->\text{NewYork}, \text{to}->\text{Toronto}]. \\
\text{flightobj}[\text{from}->\text{Seattle}, \text{to}->\text{Boston}].
\end{align*}
\]

To rectify this problem one must realize that each tuple in the \textit{flight} relation must correspond to a separate object in a rule head. The error in the above is that \textit{all} tuples in \textit{flight} correspond to the same object \textit{flightobj}. There are two general ways to achieve our goal. Both try to make sure that a new object is used in the head for each \textit{flight}-tuple.

The first method is to use a new function symbol, say \(f\), to construct the oids in the rule head:

\[
f(?F,?T):\text{flight}, f(?F,?T)[\text{from}->?F, \text{to}->?T] : \text{flight(?F,?T)}.
\]
As an added bonus, we also created a class, \texttt{flight}, and made the flight objects into the members of that class. While it solves the problem, this approach might not always be acceptable, since the oid essentially explicitly encodes all the information in the tuple.

An alternative approach is to use the \texttt{skolem{...}} primitive from Section 13. Here we are using the fact that each time \texttt{flight(?F,?T)} is satisfied, \texttt{skolem(?X)} generates a new value for $?X$.

\begin{verbatim}
%convert_rel_to_oo :-
    flight(?F,?T), skolem{?O}, insert{?O:flight[from->?F, to->?T]}.
\end{verbatim}

This approach is not as declarative as the first one, but it saves the user from the need to figure out how exactly the oids in the rule head should be constructed.

53 Miscellaneous Features

53.1 Suppression of Banners

When \texttt{ERGO} initializes itself, it generates quite a bit of chatter, which is suppressed by default. The user who needs this information (e.g., the developer), can force the chatter to appear by starting \texttt{ERGO} with

\texttt{\textit{runergo --devel}}

In normal operation, \texttt{ERGO} issues a prompt after every query or command. However, sometimes it might be necessary to suppress the prompt. For instance, when \texttt{ERGO} interacts with other programs (e.g., with a GUI) then sending the prompt to the other program just complicates things, as the receiving program needs to remember to ignore the prompt. To avoid this complication, the invocation flag \texttt{-noprompt} is provided. Thus,

\texttt{\textit{runergo --noprompt}}

will print no chatter, not even the prompt, on startup and will be just waiting for user input. When the input occurs, \texttt{ERGO} will evaluate the query and return the result. After this, it will return to wait for input without issuing any prompts.

53.2 Production and Development Compilation Modes

By default, \texttt{ERGO} compiler compiles everything in the development mode. However, before deploying an application, it is desirable to recompile it in the production mode to gain significant performance benefits. One way to do this is to put the directive
in each file. However, this is often inconvenient, takes time, and might be error-prone. An alternative method is to execute the following command at the prompt:

?- production{on}.

Executing

?- production{off}.

puts ERGO back into the development mode.

Note that the mode is reset to the default development mode after compiling any file, so production{on} must be re-executed each time when compilation in that mode is desired.

Also note that the explicit compiler directives

:- compiler_options{production=on}.
:- compiler_options{production=off}.

placed at the top of a file override any prior production{on}/production{off} commands.

54 Useful XSB Predicates Without a Counterpart in ERGO

This section contains a list of useful predicates that are available in XSB, have no direct counterpart in ERGO, and for which such counterparts are not being planned.

54.1 Time-related Predicates

- cputime(?X)\prolog — returns the CPU time in seconds (floating point number; including fractions of seconds) used by the ERGO process so far. This excludes the idle time.

- walltime(?X)\prolog — returns the total time in (including fractions of seconds) seconds that elapsed since ERGO started, including the idle time.

- epoch_seconds(?X)\prolog(machine) — time in seconds (no fractions) that has passed since Thursday, 1 January 1970.

- epoch_milliseconds(?Secs,?Fraction)\prolog(machine) — time that has passed since Thursday, 1 January 1970. Both ?Secs and ?Fraction are integers, where ?Secs is the number of seconds and ?Fraction is the number of additional milliseconds since the above date.
54.2 Hashing

- `term_hash(?Term, ?Size, ?Value)@\prolog(machine)` — binds `?Value` to the hash number of `?Term` in the range from 0 to `?Size-1`.

- `crypto_hash(?Type, ?Input, ?Result)@\prolog(machine)` — produce a cryptographic hash of the input and bind `?Result` to it. Input must be either an atom or have the form of `file(filename)@\prolog`. `?Type` specifies the type of the hash function to use. Currently, only `md5` (for MD5 hash) and `sha1` (for SHA1) are supported.

54.3 Input/Output

- `write(?X)@\prolog` and `writeln(?X)@\prolog` — these are similar to the corresponding predicates in the ERGO module `\io`, but they print out the internal form of the term bound to `?X`. For atoms, numbers, and variables, there is no substantial difference with `\io`, but for more complex terms there is. These predicates are mostly useful for debugging ERGO itself and for bug reporting.

54.4 Meta-programming

ERGO has a high-level predicate `=..`, which lets one inspect the internal structure of most ERGO's constructs in high-level terms of that system. However, if more sophisticated, low-level parsing of terms is needed, the following Prolog predicates can be used:

- `(?Left =.. ?Right)@\prolog` — decomposes the `?Left` term into a list of the form `[functor, arg1,...,argN]`. The result is bound to `?Right`.


55 Bugs in Prolog and ERGO: How to Report

The ERGO system includes a compiler and runtime libraries, but for execution it relies on Prolog. Thus, some bugs that you might encounter are the fault of ERGO, while others are Prolog bugs. For instance, a memory violation that occurs during the execution is in all likelihood an internal Prolog bug. (ERGO is a stress test — all bugs come to the surface.)
An incorrect result during the execution can be equally blamed on Prolog or on \texttt{ERGO}—it requires a close look at the knowledge base. A compiler or a runtime error issued for a perfectly valid \texttt{ERGO} specification is probably a bug in \texttt{ERGO}.

Bugs that are the fault of the underlying Prolog engine are particularly hard to fix, because \texttt{ERGO} knowledge bases are translated into mangled, unreadable to humans Prolog code. To make things worse, this code might contain calls to \texttt{ERGO} system libraries.

To simplify bug reporting, \texttt{ERGO} provides a utility that makes the compiled Prolog program more readable. The \texttt{dump} primitive can be used to strip the macros from the code, making it much easier to understand. If you issue the following command

\[
?- \texttt{dump\{foo\}.}
\]

then \texttt{foo.ergo} will be compiled without the macros and dump the result in the file \texttt{foo\_dump.P}. This file is pretty-printed to make it easier to read. Similarly,

\[
?- \texttt{dump\{foo,bar\}}
\]

will compile \texttt{foo.ergo} for module \texttt{bar} and will dump the result to the file \texttt{foo\_dump.P}.

Unfortunately, this more readable version of the translated \texttt{ERGO} specification might still not be executable on its own because it might contain calls to \texttt{ERGO} libraries or other modules. The set of guidelines, below, can help cope with these problems.

**Reporting \texttt{ERGO}-related Prolog bugs.** If you find a Prolog bug triggered by \texttt{ERGO}, here is a set of guidelines that can simplify the job of the XSB developers and increase the chances that the bug will be fixed promptly:

1. Reduce the size of your \texttt{ERGO} knowledge base as much as possible, while still being able to reproduce the bug.
2. Eliminate all calls to the system modules that use the \texttt{@lib} syntax. (Prolog modules that are accessible through the \texttt{@prolog(modname)} syntax are OK, but the more you can eliminate the better.)
3. If the knowledge base has several user modules, try to put them into one file and use just one module.
4. Use \texttt{dump\{\ldots\}} to strip \texttt{ERGO} macros from the output of the \texttt{ERGO} compiler.
5. See if the resulting program runs under XSB (without the \texttt{ERGO} shell). If it does not, it means that the program contains calls to \texttt{ERGO} runtime libraries. Try to eliminate such calls.

One common library call is used to collect all query answers in a list and then print them out. You can get rid of this library call by finding the predicate \texttt{fllibprogramans/2} in the compiled \texttt{.P} program and removing it while preserving the subgoal (the first argument) and renaming the variables (as indicated by the second argument). Make sure the resulting program is still syntactically correct!

Other calls that are often no longer needed in the dumped code are those that load \texttt{ERGO} runtime libraries (which we are trying to eliminate!). These calls have the form

\begin{verbatim}
?- flora_load_library(...).
\end{verbatim}

If there are other calls to \texttt{ERGO} runtime libraries, try to delete them, but make sure that the bug is still reproducible.

6. If the program still does not run because of the hard-to-get-rid-of calls to \texttt{ERGO} runtime libraries, then see if it runs after you execute the command

\begin{verbatim}
?- bootstrap_ergo.
\end{verbatim}

in the Prolog shell. If the program runs after this (and reproduces the bug) — it is better than nothing. If it does not, then something went wrong during the above process: start anew.

7. Try to reduce the size of the resulting program as much as possible.

8. Tell the XSB developers how to reproduce the bug. Make sure you include all the steps (including such gory details as whether it is necessary to call \texttt{bootstrap_ergo/0}).

Finally, remember to include the details of your OS and other relevant information. Some bugs might be architecture-dependent.

\textbf{Reporting \texttt{ERGO} bugs.} If you believe that the bug is in the \texttt{ERGO} system rather than in the underlying Prolog engine, the algorithm is much simpler:

1. Reduce the size of the program as much as possible by deleting unrelated rules and squeezing a multi-module program into just one file.

2. Remove all the calls to system modules, unless such a call is the essence of the bug.
3. Tell \texttt{ERGO} developers how to reproduce the bug.

The current version contains the following known bugs, which are due to the fact that certain features are yet to be implemented:

1. Certain queries may cause the following XSB error message:

\texttt{++Error[XSB]: [Compiler] '!' after table dependent symbol}

or something like that. This is due to certain limitations in the implementation of tabled predicates in the XSB system. This problem might be eliminated in a future release of XSB.

2. Inheritance of transactional methods is not supported: \texttt{a[\%p(?X)]}.

\section{The Expert Mode}

Skip this section unless you are an experienced \texttt{ERGO} user who has good understanding of the syntactic, semantic, and computational aspects of \texttt{ERGO}.

\texttt{ERGO} has plethora of syntactic constructs, which may be daunting for a novice and certain constructs are especially prone to be misused by such users to detrimental effect. To fence off these features from a novice, \texttt{ERGO}'s parser works in the novice mode by default. Only very experienced users should work in the expert mode—see Section 47.2 for how to do that.

The following syntactic constructs are available only in the expert mode:

- \textit{Shortcut for charlists}. This shortcut permits to write "\texttt{abc}" instead of "\texttt{abc}^\texttt{\charlist}". Charlists are commonly used for parsing, but novice users tend to misuse them for the same purpose as atoms. Because charlists are much more expensive in terms of memory, compilation time, and various runtime operations, using them in place of atoms is a very bad idea.

- \textit{Embedded ISA-literals in rule heads}. An embedded ISA-literal is one that appears as an argument to a predicate, function symbol, or is part of a composite frame. For instance, \texttt{p(a:b), p(a,f(c:d)), a:b[c\rightarrow d:f]}. \texttt{ERGO} allows these to appear in rule bodies and in facts, but their appearance in rule heads (that have non-empty body) is restricted to the expert mode.

One reason why embedded ISA-literals in rule heads are not advisable to novice users is because they tend to confuse them with typed variables. Note that

\begin{verbatim}
p(?X:foo) :- ...
p(?X^^foo) :- ...
\end{verbatim}
are very different things and using the first form is frequently a mistake. An embedded ISA-literal, \( p(?X:foo) \), represents the conjunction \( p(?X), \ ?X:foo \), so the first rule above is equivalent to

\[
p(?X), \ ?X:foo :- ...\]

That is, \(?X:foo\) is derived, not checked. Inexperienced users tend to incorrectly assume the latter. On the other hand, the second rule, one that uses typed variables is equivalent to

\[
p(?X) :- \ ?X:foo, ...\]

but using \(?X``foo\) can be much more efficient, since the actual tests for class membership are done only when the variable gets bound.

- **Expanded scope of the operators \( \rightarrow \) and \( \Rightarrow \).** The symbols \( \rightarrow \) and \( \Rightarrow \) are infix operators when they appear in the context of a frame. In other contexts, using them as infix operators will cause an error, as mistyping round parentheses for square brackets is a common mistake. Advanced users, however, may wish to use these operators for other purposes as well, e.g., to simulate predicates with named arguments, such as \( p(foo\rightarrow1,bar\rightarrow2) \). However, this syntax, is allowed only in the expert mode.

- **The \( <== > \) and \( <~~ > \) double implications.** These double-implications are blocked off in the novice mode because inexperienced users tend make logical mistakes by using “iff” when only “if” is called for.
Appendices

A A BNF-style Grammar for ERGO

This BNF is an approximation of the operator-based, context sensitive syntax used in ERGO. Not all features mentioned in the preceding sections (especially directives and a number of non-logical commands) are listed in this BNF.

%% To avoid confusion between some language elements and meta-syntax
%% (e.g., parentheses and brackets are part of BNF and also of the language
%% being described), we enclose some symbols in single quotes to make it
%% clear that they are part of the language syntax, not of the grammar.
%% However, in ERGO these symbols can be used with or without the quotes.

Statement := (Rule | Query | LatentQuery | Directive) '.'

Rule := (RuleDescriptor)? Head (':-' Body)? '.'

Query := '?-' Body '.'

LatentQuery := RuleDescriptor '!'- Body '.'

| IgnoreDependencyCheckDirective | ImportModuleDirective

RuleDescriptor := '{' RuleTag '}'
| '{' BooleanRuleDescriptor '}'
| '@!'{' RuleId ('[DescrBody'])? '}'

RuleTag := Term
RuleId := Term
BooleanRuleDescriptor := Term
DescrBody := DescrBodyElement (',' DescrBodyElement)*
DescrBodyElement := Term | Term '->' Term

%% Heads in ERGO (not FLORA-2) can also have ==>, <=>, <=>, \or, and quantifiers
Head := ('\neg')? HeadLiteral
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Head := Head (’,’ | ’\and’) Head

HeadLiteral := BinaryRelationship | ObjectSpecification | Term

Body := BodyLiteral
Body := BodyConjunct | BodyDisjunct | BodyNegative | ControlFlowStatement
\%
exists’ can be used instead of ’exist’.
\%
Body-parentheses are optional, if Body is BodyLiteral
Body := ’forall(’ VarList ’)’ , ’exist(’ VarList ’)’ ,’(~’ ,’(’ Body ’)’
Body := Body ’@’ ModuleName
Body := BodyConstraint

ModuleName := Atom | ’Atom(’)’ | Atom ’(’ Atom ’)’ | ThisModuleName

BodyConjunct := Body (’,’ | ’\and’) Body
BodyDisjunct := Body (’;’ | ’\or’) Body
BodyNegative := (’\naf’ | ’\neg | ’\+’) Body
BodyConstraint := ’{’ CLPR-style constraint ’}’

ControlFlowStatement := IfThenElse | UnlessDo
 | WhileDo | WhileLoop
 | DoUntil | LoopUntil
IfThenElse := ’\if’ Body ’\then’ Body (’\else’ Body)?
 | Body ’<~~’ Body | Body ’~~>’ Body | Body ’<~~>’ Body
 | Body ’<==’ Body | Body ’==>’ Body | Body ’<==>’ Body
UnlessDo := ’\unless’ Body ’\do’ Body
WhileDo := ’\while’ Body ’\do’ Body
WhileLoop := ’\while’ Body ’\loop’ Body
DoUntil := ’\do’ Body ’\until’ Body
LoopUntil := ’\loop’ Body ’\until’ Body

BodyLiteral := BinaryRelationship | ObjectSpecification | Term
 | DBUpdate | RuleUpdate | Refresh
 | NewSkolemOp | Builtin | Loading | Compiling
 | CatchExpr | ThrowExpr | TruthTest

Builtin := ArithmeticComparison | Unification | MetaUnification | ...

Loading := ’[’ LoadingCommand (’,’ LoadingCommand)* ’]’
 | ’load{’ LoadingCommand (’,’ LoadingCommand)* ’}’
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LoadingCommand := Filename ('>>' Atom)

Compiling := 'compile{' Filename '}'

BinaryRelationship := PathExpression ':' PathExpression
BinaryRelationship := PathExpression '::' PathExpression

ObjectSpecification := PathExpression '[' SpecBody ']

SpecBody := ('
af')? MethodSpecification
SpecBody := ('

eg')? ExplicitlyNegatableMethodSpecification
SpecBody := SpecBody ',' SpecBody
SpecBody := SpecBody ';' SpecBody

MethodSpecification := ('%'')? Term
MethodSpecification := PathExpression
(ValueReferenceConnective | SigReferenceConnective)
PathExpression

ValueReferenceConnective := '->' | '+>>' | '-->' | '-->>'

SigReferenceConnective := ('{' (Integer|Variable) ':' (Integer|Variable) '}')? ('=>' )

ExplicitlyNegatableMethodSpecification := Term
ExplicitlyNegatableMethodSpecification :=
PathExpression ExplicitlyNegatableReferenceConnective PathExpression

ExplicitlyNegatableReferenceConnective := '->' | SigReferenceConnective

PathExpression := Atom | Number | String | Iri | Variable | SpecialOidToken
PathExpression := Term | List | ReifiedFormula
PathExpression := PathExpression PathExpressionConnective PathExpression
PathExpression := BinaryRelationship
PathExpression := ObjectSpecification
PathExpression := Aggregate

Iri := SQname | FullIri

SQname := Identifier '#' String
FullIri := 'Śtring

PathExpressionConnective := '. | '!

SpecialOidToken := AnonymousSkolem | NumberedSkolem | NamedSkolem | ThisModuleName

ReifiedFormula := '${' (Body | '(' Rule ')') '}

%% No quotes are allowed in the following quasi-constants!
%% No space allowed between \# and Integer and \# and AlphanumAtom
%% AnonymousSkolem & NumberedSkolem can occur only in rule head
%% or in reified formulas
AnonymousSkolem := '\#'

%% No space between \# and Integer
NumberedSkolem := '\#'Integer

%% No space between \# and AlphanumAtom
NamedSkolem := '\#'AlphanumAtom

ThisModuleName := '\@'

List := [' [' PathExpression (',', PathExpression)* ('|' PathExpression)? ' ] ]

Term := Functor '(' Arguments ')

Term := '% Functor '(' Arguments ')

Functor

Arguments := PathExpression (',', PathExpression)*

Aggregate := AggregateOperator '{ ' TargetVariable (GroupingVariables)? ' | ' Body '}'
AggregateOperator := 'max' | 'min' | 'avg' | 'sum' | 'setof' | 'bagof'
%% Note: only one TargetVariable is permitted.
%% It must be a variable, not a term. If you need to aggregate over terms,
%% as for example, in setof/bagof, use the following idiom:
%% S = setof{ V | ... , V=Term }
TargetVariable := Variable

GroupingVariables := '[' VarList ']

Variable := '?' ([_a-zA-Z] [_a-zA-Z0-9]*)?

VarList := Variable, (',', Variable)*
The ERGO debugger is implemented as a presentation layer on top of the Prolog debugger, so familiarity with the latter is highly recommended (XSB Manual, Part I). Here we sketch only a few basics.

The debugger has two facilities: tracing and spying. Tracing allows the user to watch the execution step by step, and spying allows one to tell ERGO that it must pause when execution reaches certain predicates or object methods. The user can trace the execution from then on. At present, only the tracing facility has been implemented in ERGO.

**Tracing.** To start tracing, you must issue the command `\trace` at the ERGO prompt. It is also possible to put the subgoal `\trace` in the middle of a program. In that case, tracing will start after this subgoal gets executed. This is useful when you know where exactly you want to start tracing the program. To stop tracing, type `\notrace`.

During tracing, the user is normally prompted at the four parts of subgoal execution: **Call** (when a subgoal is first called), **Exit** (when the call exits), **Redo** (when the subgoal is tried with a different binding on backtracking), and **Fail** (when a subgoal fails). At each of the prompts,
the user can issue a number of commands. The most common ones are listed below. See the XSB manual for more.

- **carriage return (creep)**: to go to the next step
- **s (skip)**: execute this subgoal non-interactively; prompt again when the call exits (or fails)
- **S (verbose skip)**: like s, but also show the trace generated by this execution
- **l (leap)**: stop tracing and execute the remainder of the program

The behavior of the debugger is controlled by the predicate `debug_ctl`. For instance, executing `debug_ctl(profile, on)` at the ERGO prompt tells XSB to measure the CPU time it takes to execute each call. This is useful for tuning your knowledge base for performance. Other useful controls are: `debug_ctl(prompt, off)`, which causes the trace to be generated without user intervention; and `debug_ctl(redirect, foobar)`, which redirects debugger output to the file named `foobar`. The latter feature is usually useful only in conjunction with the aforesaid prompt-off mode. See the XSB manual for additional information on debugger control.

ERGO provides a convenient shortcut that captures some of the most common uses of the aforesaid `debug_ctl` interface. Executing

```
?- \trace('foobar.txt').
```

will switch ERGO to non-interactive trace mode and the entire trace will be dumped to file `foobar.txt`. Note that you have to execute `\notrace` or exit Prolog in order for the entire file to be flushed to disk.

Another useful form of non-interactive tracing is to dump the trace into a file in the form of ERGO facts, so that the file could later be loaded and queried. This is accomplished with the following call:

```
?- \trace('foobar.txt',log).
```

The second argument denotes the option to be passed to the trace facility. Currently the only available option is `log`. The form of the facts is as follows:

```
flora_tracelog(CallId,CallNumber,PortType,CurrentCall,Time)
```

Here `CallId` is an identifier generated when the engine encounters a new top-level call. This identifier remains the same for all subgoals called while tracing that top-level call. `CallNumber` is the call number that the underlying generates to show the nesting of the calls being traced. It
is the same number that the user sees when tracing interactively. PortType is 'Call', 'Redo', 'Exit', or 'Fail'. CurrentCall is the call being traced. Time is the CPU time it took to execute CurrentCall. On 'Call' and 'Redo', Time is always 0 — it has a meaningful value only for the 'Exit' and 'Fail' log entries.

Low-level tracing. The ERGO debugger also supports low-level tracing via the shell command tracelow. With normal tracing, the debugger converts low-level subgoals to ERGO syntax and are thus meaningful to the programmer. With low-level tracing, the debugger displays the actual Prolog subgoals (of the compiled .P program) that are being executed. This facility is useful for debugging ERGO runtime libraries.

As with \trace, ERGO provides a convenient shortcut that allows the entire execution trace to be dumped into a file:

?- tracelow('foobar.txt').

As with the \trace/1 call, there is a \tracelow/2 version:

?- tracelow('foobar.txt',log).

which dumps the trace in the form of queriable facts. However, in this case the facts are in the low-level Prolog form, not ERGO form.
For Emacs Aficionados: Editing and Invoking ERGO in Emacs

For power-users who prefer Emacs to all other editors, ERGO includes a special major mode, ergo-mode. This mode provides support for syntactic highlighting, automatic indentation, and the ability to load knowledge bases and pose ERGO queries right out of the Emacs buffer.

Note that this mode has not been tested in XEmacs—only in Emacs.

C.1 Installation of ergo-mode

To install ergo-mode, you must perform the following steps. Put the file

\ldots/\text{Ergo}/\text{emacs}/\text{ergo.elc}

found in your ERGO distribution on the load path of Emacs. The best way to work with Emacs is to make a separate directory for Emacs libraries (if you do not already have one), and put \text{ergo.elc} there. Such a directory can be added to the emacs search path by putting the following command in the file \text{$\sim$}/.\text{emacs} (in Windows the .\text{emacs} file will likely be in your home directory):

\begin{verbatim}
(setq load-path (cons "your-directory" load-path))
\end{verbatim}

Finally, you must tell Emacs how to recognize ERGO files, so Emacs will be able to invoke ergo-mode automatically when you are editing such files:

\begin{verbatim}
(setq auto-mode-alist
  (cons ("\"flr$\"\"\".ergo$\"\".ergotxt$\"") . ergo-mode) auto-mode-alist))
(autoload "ergo-mode" "ergo" "Major mode for editing ERGO knowledge bases." t)
\end{verbatim}

and where the ERGO startup script is:

\begin{verbatim}
(setq ergo-program-path "full-path-to-your-runergo-script")
\end{verbatim}

This script is found in the ERGO reasoner’s installation folder. In Linux and Mac it is called runergo and in Windows it is runergo.bat.

C.2 Functionality of ergo-mode

The Ergo menu. Once ERGO editing mode is installed, it provides a number of functions. First, whenever you edit a ERGO file, you will see the “Ergo” menu in the menubar. This menu provides
commands for starting and stopping the ERGO process (i.e., the ERGO shell). When this process starts, a command window will appear in a separate Emacs buffer, and you can type commands to it as in a regular terminal window. In addition, the menu Ergo in the menubar lets one send queries to the ERGO process directly from Emacs buffers containing ERGO statements, and one can load and add portions of these buffers, entire buffers, or other files.

Because Emacs provides automatic file completion and allows you to edit what you typed, performing these operations directly out of the Emacs buffer is much faster than typing the corresponding commands to the ERGO shell.

Keystrokes. In addition to the menu, ergo-mode lets you execute most of the menu commands using the keyboard. Once you get the hang of it, keyboard commands are much faster to invoke:

- **Load file:** Ctl-c Ctl-f
- **Load buffer:** Ctl-c Ctl-b
- **Load region:** Ctl-c Ctl-r

When you invoke any of the above commands, a ERGO process is started, unless it is already running. However, if you want to invoke this process explicitly, type

ESC x run-flora

You can control the ERGO process using the following commands:

- **Interrupt Ergo Process:** Ctl-c Ctl-c
- **Quit Ergo Process:** Ctl-c Ctl-d
- **Restart Ergo Process:** Ctl-c Ctl-s

Interrupting ERGO is equivalent to typing Ctl-c at the ERGO prompt. Quitting the process stops the Prolog engine, and restarting the process shuts down the old Prolog process and starts a new one with the ERGO shell running.

Indentation. The Emacs editing mode for ERGO understands many aspects of the ERGO syntax, which enables it to provide correct indentation in most cases. The only area where ERGO sometimes gets indentation wrong is when nested control constructs are used (e.g., nested if-then-else, while-do, etc.).

The most common way of using the indentation facility is by typing the TAB-key. This tells ergo-mode to indent the line according to its taste. In most cases, after you finish the previous line and type <Enter>, ergo-mode will guess correctly where the next line should start. If it cannot
guess, typing TAB after the line is finished will indent the line properly. Closing parentheses and some other characters are *electric*, meaning that typing them may also cause Emacs to indent the current line.
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