

Chapter 8

Termination of Programs

Outline

- Level mappings
- Generally terminating programs: Recurrent programs
- Left terminating programs: Acceptable programs

Does this Program Terminate?

```
wine(riesling, chicken).  
wine(riesling, veal).  
wine(kerner, veal).
```

```
diff(riesling, kerner).  
diff(kerner, riesling).
```

```
interchangeable(X, Y) :- wine(X, Z), wine(Y, Z), diff(X, Y).
```

Do these two Terminate?

```
edge(a, b).  
edge(b, c).  
edge(d, e).  
path(X, Y) :- edge(X, Y).  
path(X, Y) :- edge(X, Z), path(Z, Y).
```

```
arc(a, b).  
arc(b, c).  
arc(d, e).  
connected(X, Y) :- arc(X, Y).  
connected(X, Y) :- connected(X, Z), arc(Z, Y).
```

And this one?

```
edge(a, b).
```

```
edge(b, c).
```

```
edge(d, e).
```

```
edge(c, a).
```

```
path(X, Y) :- edge(X, Y).
```

```
path(X, Y) :- edge(X, Z), path(Z, Y).
```

What About this one?

```
edge(a, b).
```

```
edge(b, c).
```

```
edge(d, e).
```

```
edge(c, a).
```

```
dpath(X, Y, _) :- edge(X, Y).
```

```
dpath(X, Y, Depth) :-
```

```
    Depth > 0,
```

```
    edge(X, Z),
```

```
    Depth1 is Depth - 1,
```

```
    dpath(Z, Y, Depth1).
```

```
path(X, Y) :- dpath(X, Y, 10).
```

A Difficult one ...

```
jump(1).
```

```
jump(N) :-
```

```
    N > 1, N mod 2 === 1, N1 is 3*N + 1, jump(N1).
```

```
jump(N) :-
```

```
    N > 1, N mod 2 === 0, N1 is N // 2, jump(N1).
```

Termination May Depend on the Query

```
app([], X, X).  
app([X|Y], Z, [X|U]) :- app(Y, Z, U).
```

The query `app([a,b], Y, Z)` terminates.

The query `app(X, Y, [c,d])` terminates.

The query `app(X, [e,f], Z)` does not terminate.

How can we prove that certain programs and queries terminate?

General vs. PROLOG Termination

```
app([], X, X).  
app([X|Y], Z, [X|U]) :- app(Y, Z, U).
```

```
app3(X, Y, Z, U) :- app(X, Y, V), app(V, Z, U).
```

Query `app3([a], [b], [c], U)` has an infinite SLD-derivation.

However, PROLOG terminates.

Multisets

multiset (written $bag(a_1, \dots, a_n)$)

$:\Leftrightarrow$

unordered sequence a_1, \dots, a_n

\prec (on finite multisets of natural numbers)

$:\Leftrightarrow$

$X \prec Y$ iff $X = (Y - bag(a)) \cup Z$

for some $a \in Y$ and Z such that $\forall b \in Z. b < a$

We write $old(X, Y) :\Leftrightarrow a$ and $new(X, Y) :\Leftrightarrow Z$.

Note: \prec is irreflexive and antisymmetric

Multiset Ordering

transitive closure of a relation R on a set \mathcal{A}

$:\Leftrightarrow$

smallest transitive relation on \mathcal{A} that contains R

multiset ordering $(\prec_m) :\Leftrightarrow$ transitive closure of \prec

Theorem 6.4

The multiset ordering \prec_m is well-founded.

Two Helpful Observations

Lemma 6.2

An infinite, finitely branching tree has an infinite branch.

Note 6.3

An irreflexive, antisymmetric relation is well-founded iff its transitive closure is well-founded.

Thus finiteness of an SLD-tree (hence, termination) can be proved by finding a suitable multiset assignment for queries.

Level Mappings

level mapping for program P $:\Leftrightarrow$ function $|\cdot| : HB_P \mapsto \mathbb{N}$

level of ground atom A $:\Leftrightarrow |A|$

clause c **recurrent** w.r.t. $|\cdot|$

$:\Leftrightarrow$

for every ground instance $A \leftarrow \underline{B}$ of c and every $B \in \underline{B}$:

$$|A| > |B|$$

program P **recurrent** $:\Leftrightarrow$ for some level mapping $|\cdot|$,
each $c \in P$ is recurrent w.r.t. $|\cdot|$

Example (I)

```
member(x, [x|y]) ←  
member(x, [y|z]) ← member(x, z)
```

With $| \textit{member}(s, t) | \Leftrightarrow$ “listsize” of t , the clauses are recurrent.

```
subset([x|y], z) ← member(x, z), subset(y, z)  
subset([], x) ←
```

Define $| \textit{subset}(s, t) | \Leftrightarrow \textit{listsize}(s) + \textit{listsize}(t)$.

This shows that the entire program is recurrent.

Incidentally, the program always terminates for ground queries.

Example (II)

```
app([ ], x, x) ←  
app([x|y], z, [x|u]) ← app(y, z, u)  
rev([ ], [ ]) ←  
rev([x|y], z) ← rev(y, u), app(u, [x], z)
```

This program is not recurrent.

Incidentally, it does not always terminate for ground queries.

```
rev([a, b], c) ⇒ rev([b], u1), app(u1, [a], c)  
⇒ rev([ ], u2), app(u2, [b], u1), app(u1, [a], c)  
⇒ rev([ ], u2), app(y3, [b], u3), app(u1, [a], c)  
⇒ ...
```

Bounded Queries

atom A **bounded** w.r.t. $||$

$:\Leftrightarrow$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $|A'| \leq k$ for all $A' \in \text{ground}(A)$

level $|A|$ of bounded atom $A : \Leftrightarrow \max\{|A'| \mid A' \in \text{ground}(A)\}$

query bounded w.r.t. $|| : \Leftrightarrow$ all its atoms are bounded w.r.t. $||$

query A_1, \dots, A_n bounded by $k : \Leftrightarrow |A_i| \leq k$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$

level $|Q|$ of bounded query $Q = A_1, \dots, A_n$

$:\Leftrightarrow \text{bag}(|A_1|, \dots, |A_n|)$

Boundedness Lemma for Recurrent Programs

Lemma 6.8

Let P be a recurrent (w.r.t. $||$) program. If Q_1 is a query bounded w.r.t. $||$ and Q_2 an SLD-resolvent of Q_1 , then

- Q_2 is bounded w.r.t. $||$
- $|Q_2| \prec_m |Q_1|$

Proof:

1. Any instance Q' of Q is bounded and satisfies $|Q'| \preceq_m |Q|$.
2. An instance of a recurrent clause is recurrent.
3. For every recurrent $H \leftarrow \underline{B}$ and every bounded $\underline{A}, H, \underline{C}$, $\underline{A}, \underline{B}, \underline{C}$ is bounded and satisfies $|\underline{A}, \underline{B}, \underline{C}| \prec_m |\underline{A}, H, \underline{C}|$.

Finiteness for Recurrent Programs

Corollary 6.9

Let P be a recurrent program and Q a bounded query.
Then all SLD-derivations of $P \cup \{Q\}$ are finite.

Verifying Termination

listsize of a term t ($|t|$)

$:\Leftrightarrow$

$$|[s|t]| = |t| + 1$$

$$|f(t_1, \dots, t_n)| = 0 \text{ if } f \neq [\cdot|\cdot]$$

$list([\])$ \leftarrow
 $list([x|y])$ $\leftarrow list(y)$

Defining $|list(t)| :\Leftrightarrow |t|$

shows that this program is recurrent,
hence always terminating for bounded queries.

Importance of Choice of Level Mapping

$$\begin{array}{l} app([], x, x) \leftarrow \\ app([x|y], z, [x|u]) \leftarrow app(y, z, u) \end{array}$$

These clauses are recurrent w.r.t. $|app(x, y, z)|_1 : \Leftrightarrow |x|$
and also w.r.t. $|app(x, y, z)|_2 : \Leftrightarrow |z|$.

In each case we obtain different bounded queries.

E.g., $app([a, b], y, z)$ is bounded w.r.t. $| \cdot |_1$ but not w.r.t. $| \cdot |_2$

$app(x, y, [c, d])$ is bounded w.r.t. $| \cdot |_2$ but not w.r.t. $| \cdot |_1$

Both these queries are bounded w.r.t.

$$|app(x, y, z)|_3 : \Leftrightarrow \min(|x|, |z|)$$

Limitations: General SLD vs. Prolog (I)

```
edge(a, b).  
edge(b, c).  
edge(d, e).  
path(X, Y) :- edge(X, Y).  
path(X, Y) :- edge(X, Z), path(Z, Y).
```

```
arc(a, b).  
arc(b, c).  
arc(d, e).  
connected(X, Y) :- arc(X, Y).  
connected(X, Y) :- connected(X, Z), arc(Z, Y).
```

Neither program is recurrent.

However, all **LD**-derivations for the **first** program are finite.

Limitations: General SLD vs. Prolog (II)

```
app([ ], x, x) ←  
app([x|y], z, [x|u]) ← app(y, z, u)  
app3(x, y, z, u) ← app(x, y, v), app(v, z, u)
```

$$|app(x, y, z)| :\Leftrightarrow \min(|x|, |z|)$$

$$|app3(x, y, z, u)| :\Leftrightarrow |x| + |u| + 1$$

shows that the program is recurrent.

But $app3([a], [b], [c], u)$ is not bounded w.r.t. $||$ and indeed has an infinite derivation.

However, all LD-derivations of $P \cup \{app3([a], [b], [c], u)\}$ are finite.

Acceptable Programs

clause c **acceptable** w.r.t. level mapping $||$ and interpretation I

$:\Leftrightarrow$

I model of c ,

for every ground instance $A \leftarrow \underline{A}, B, \underline{B}$ of c and every B such that $I \models \underline{A}$:

$$|A| > |B|$$

program P **acceptable**

$:\Leftrightarrow$ for some level mapping $||$ and interpretation I , each $c \in P$ is acceptable

w.r.t. $||$ and I

Example (I)

```
app([ ], x, x) ←  
app([x|y], z, [x|u]) ← app(y, z, u)  
rev([ ], [ ]) ←  
rev([x|y], z) ← rev(y, u), app(u, [x], z)
```

$$|app(x, y, z)| :\Leftrightarrow \min(|x|, |z|)$$

$$|rev(x, y)| :\Leftrightarrow |x|$$

$$I :\Leftrightarrow \{app(x, y, z) \mid |x| + |y| = |z|\} \\ \cup \{rev(x, y) \mid |x| = |y|\}$$

shows that the program is acceptable.

Example (II)

```
app([ ], x, x) ←  
app([x|y], z, [x|u]) ← app(y, z, u)  
app3(x, y, z, u) ← app(x, y, v), app(v, z, u)
```

$$|app(x, y, z)| :\Leftrightarrow |x|$$

$$|app3(x, y, z, u)| :\Leftrightarrow |x| + |y| + 1$$

$$I :\Leftrightarrow \{app(x, y, z) \mid |x| + |y| = |z|\} \\ \cup \mathit{ground}(app3(x, y, z, u))$$

shows that the program is acceptable.

Acceptability vs. Recurrence

Note 6.21

A program is recurrent w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|$
iff it is acceptable w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|$ and HB .

An Extended Notion of Boundedness (I)

Let $||$ be a level mapping, I an interpretation, $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

query Q **bounded by k w.r.t. $||$ and I**

$:\Leftrightarrow$

for every ground instance $\underline{A}, B, \underline{B}$ of Q such that $I \models \underline{A}$,
 $|B| \leq k$

query Q bounded w.r.t. $||$ and I

$:\Leftrightarrow Q$ bounded by some k w.r.t. $||$ and I

Example

```
app([], x, x) ←  
app([x|y], z, [x|u]) ← app(y, z, u)  
app3(x, y, z, u) ← app(x, y, v), app(v, z, u)
```

$$|app(x, y, z)| :\Leftrightarrow |x|$$

$$|app3(x, y, z, u)| :\Leftrightarrow |x| + |y| + 1$$

$$I :\Leftrightarrow \{app(x, y, z) \mid |x| + |y| = |z|\} \\ \cup \mathit{ground}(app3(x, y, z, u))$$

The program is acceptable (w.r.t. $||$ and I),
and $app3([a], [b], [c], u)$ is bounded (by $k = 3$) w.r.t. $||$ and I .

A Notational Convention

max: $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) \mapsto \mathbb{N} \cup \{\omega\}$ with

$$\mathbf{max} S: \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } S = \emptyset \\ n & \text{if } S \text{ is finite but not empty and with maximum } n \\ \omega & \text{if } S \text{ is infinite} \end{cases}$$

An Extended Notion of Boundedness (II)

Let Q be a query consisting of $n \geq 1$ atoms.

Then for every $i = 1, \dots, n$ and every interpretation I ,

$$|Q|_i^I : \Leftrightarrow \{ |A_i| : A_1, \dots, A_n \text{ ground instance of } Q \\ I \models A_1, \dots, A_{i-1} \}$$

If Q is bounded w.r.t. some $||$ and I , then

$$|Q|_I : \Leftrightarrow \text{bag}(\max |Q|_1^I, \dots, \max |Q|_n^I)$$

Example

$$\begin{aligned} \text{app}([\], x, x) &\leftarrow \\ \text{app}([x|y], z, [x|u]) &\leftarrow \text{app}(y, z, u) \\ \text{app3}(x, y, z, u) &\leftarrow \text{app}(x, y, v), \text{app}(v, z, u) \end{aligned}$$

$$|\text{app}(x, y, z)| \Leftrightarrow |x|$$

$$|\text{app3}(x, y, z, u)| \Leftrightarrow |x| + |y| + 1$$

$$I \Leftrightarrow \{\text{app}(x, y, z) \mid |x| + |y| = |z|\}$$

$$\cup \text{ground}(\text{app3}(x, y, z, u))$$

$$|\text{app3}([a], [b], [c], u)|_I = \text{bag}(3)$$

$$|\text{app}([a], [b], v_1), \text{app}(v_1, [c], u)|_I = \text{bag}(1, 2)$$

Boundedness Lemma for Acceptable Programs

Lemma 6.23

Let P be an acceptable (w.r.t. $||$ and I) program. If Q_1 is a query bounded w.r.t. $||$ and I , and if Q_2 is an LD-resolvent of Q_1 , then

- Q_2 is bounded w.r.t. $||$ and I
- $|Q_2|_I \prec_m |Q_1|_I$

Proof:

1. Any instance Q' of Q is bounded and satisfies $|Q'|_I \preceq_m |Q|_I$.
2. An instance of an acceptable clause is acceptable.
3. For every acceptable $A \leftarrow \underline{B}$ and every bounded A, \underline{C} , $\underline{B}, \underline{C}$ is bounded and satisfies $|\underline{B}, \underline{C}|_I \prec_m |A, \underline{C}|_I$.

(See the book on page 161.)

Finiteness for Acceptable Programs

Corollary 6.24

Let P be an acceptable program and Q a bounded query.
Then all LD-derivations of $P \cup \{Q\}$ are finite.

Application

```
app([], x, x) ←  
app([x|y], z, [x|u]) ← app(y, z, u)  
perm([], []) ←  
perm(x, [y|z]) ← app(u, [y|v], x), app(u, v, w), perm(w, z)
```

$$|app(x, y, z)| \Leftrightarrow \min(|x|, |z|)$$

$$|perm(x, y)| \Leftrightarrow |x| + 1$$

$$I \Leftrightarrow \{app(x, y, z) \mid |x| + |y| = |z|\} \\ \cup \mathit{ground}(perm(x, y))$$

This shows that the program is acceptable.

Objectives

- Level mappings
- Generally terminating programs: Recurrent programs
- Left terminating programs: Acceptable programs