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Abstract

This note clarifies how to handle solution gathering meta-calls, asserts and retracts in the groundness analysis of Prolog.

1 Introduction

Most work on static program analysis for Prolog has concentrated on the design of abstract domains and their operations, rather than issues of how builtins such as meta-calls and dynamic predicates should be handled. Many realistic programs contain such builtins, however, and so this is an important issue to address when constructing an analyser [2–4,6,7]. This note details how builtins are handled in a groundness analyser developed at the University of Kent in collaboration with the Universities of Ben-Gurion and Leeds. This analyser is composed to two core modules: an abstracter module which takes, as input, a program and produces, as output, an abstract version of the program that only expresses grounding dependency information; a fixpoint engine which traces the dependencies in the abstract program to infer which arguments of the input program are ground. Builtins pose (at least) four problems for static analysis and, in particular, program abstraction:

meta-call problem The problem with a goal such as call(G) is that the principal functor of the goal G might not be known until run-time and thus we cannot in general trace the call to G and deduce its answer (and those its possibly generates through sub-goals). Analogous safety problems can occur with bagof, findall, once, not and setof.

solution gathering problem A particular problem that occurs in solution gathering meta-calls such as findall(T, p(S, T), B) is that they cannot simply be abstracted as p(S, T) or even p(S, B). This is because the goal findall(T, p(S, T), B) neither instantiates S nor T (though it might ground B). Analogous problems occur with bagof and setof.
assert problem The problem with assert goals is that they can extend the program at run-time and thereby introduce new calls and answers. Specifically, suppose that a program consists of the facts \( p(c) \) and \( q(\_\_) \) and the clause \( r(X) \leftarrow \text{assert}(\langle p(Y) \leftarrow q(Y) \rangle), \ p(X) \). The query \( r(X) \) will call the assert goal. This asserts the clause \( p(Y) \leftarrow q(Y) \) which, in turn, introduces a new computation path through \( q(Y) \) (which has true as its call and answer patterns) and leads to answer pattern of true for the top-level goal \( r(X) \). If the assert was merely ignored, then call and answer patterns for \( q \) would be missed, and an incorrect answer pattern for \( r \) would be inferred.

retract problem The problem with a retract goal is basically one of precision. Consider a program that shares data between two program points using dynamic predicates to implement a blackboard mechanism. The call \( \text{assert(data(I))} \) will write (and extend) the blackboard and elsewhere in the program the call \( \text{retract(data(O))} \) will read (and prune) the blackboard. The goal \( \text{retract(data(O))} \) can be safely abstracted by \textit{true}. Precision could be improved, however, if we can infer that \( I \) is ground when the goal \( \text{assert(data(I))} \) is called because then \( \text{retract(data(O))} \) must ground \( O \).

To resolve the meta-call problem (and much of the assert problem) we follow the elegant analysis model set out in \cite{3,4} in which there are assumed to be two versions of the program: one (virgin) program that is unanalysed; and another (renamed) version that is completely analysed. The idea is for the renamed version to only express information about the calls that the analysis is able to trace. The renamed program is constructed by substituting each atom (that is not a builtin) in the virgin program, \( G = p(t_1, \ldots, t_n) \), with new atom, \( G' = p'(t_1, \ldots, t_n) \). Henceforth, \( G' \) will denote the rename of \( G \). Top-level calls, as such those specified in the export declarations of a module interface, are directed at the renamed predicates. Renaming ensures that calls in one version of the program cannot normally invoke predicates in the other. One exception is with meta-calls which occur in the renamed program. These build unrenamed goals and thus call the virgin program. The other exception is with asserts that occur in the renamed program. The bodies of asserted clauses are composed of unrenamed goals and therefore can call into the virgin program. The important point is that these calls (and those they generate) do not need to be tracked to safely reason about the call and answer patterns of the renamed program. This means that, if desired, a meta-call such as \( \text{call}(G) \) can safely be ignored during analysis. Note, however, that precision may be improved by replacing \( \text{call}(G) \) with the goal \( G' \) if its principal functor is known.

To summarise, the two program model of \cite{3,4} essentially buys safety at the expense of doubling the size of the program.

With this model in mind, section 2 details how meta-calls and solution gathering goals are handled, and sections 3 and 4 explains how assert and retract goals are dealt with. As far as we aware, previous work has not considered the solution gathering problem and also the literature on handling assert and
retract contains a number of holes. The appendix lists the groundness abstrac-
tions for a set of (less problematic) builtins. Section 5 concludes.

2 Meta-call and bagof problem

The two program model of [2,4] enables meta-calls to G to be (essentially)
ignored during analysis. If the principal functor of G is known, however, it is
usually better to replace the meta-call with a call to G' as is described below.

2.1 The call, once and not goals

Goals such as call(G) and once(G) can be handled as if they were G'. Goals
such as not(G) and \+(G), however, are replaced with the goal p(X1, . . . , Xn)
where p is a new predicate symbol and var(G) = \{X1, . . . , Xn\}. The new
predicate is defined as the clause p(X1, . . . , Xn) :- G', !, fail and the fact
p(X1, . . . , Xn). This essentially unfolds the definition of not(G').

2.2 The bagof, setof and findall goals

These goals are not entirely straightforward to abstract since they cannot be
treated as normal meta-calls. The meta-call bagof(T, G, B) binds B to a list
of instances of the template T generated through all the proofs of the goal G.
(To simplify the presentation, we assume that T and B are variables.) The
meta-call fails if G fails. More generally, meta-calls can take the form bagof(T,
Y1, . . . , Yn \+ G, B) where \+ denotes existential quantification. Variables that are
not quantified (and do not correspond to T) can be bound by a proof of
G. The goal bagof(T, Y1, . . . , Yn \+ G, B) can be handled by replacing it with
p(X1, . . . , Xn, B) where var(G) \{T, Y1, . . . , Yn\} = \{X1, . . . , Xn\} and p is a
new predicate defined by the clause p(X1, . . . , Xn, B) :- G', copy-term(T, B).
G' cannot propagate bindings through Y1, . . . , Ym since these variables are not
arguments of p. The setof meta-call can be treated similarly.

The meta-call findall(T, G, B) differs from bagof and setof in that it always
succeeds and never binds any variables of G. Furthermore, the solution list
is made up of variants of the instances of T that are generated through solv-
ing G. The meta-call is thus handled by replacing findall(T, G, B) with the
goal p(X1, . . . , Xn, B) where var(G) \{T\} = \{X1, . . . , Xn\} and p is a new
predicate defined by the clauses p(X1, . . . , Xn, B) :- G', copy-term(T, B) and
p(X1, . . . , Xn, B) :- ground(B).
Observe that \( \text{copy_term}(T, B) \) is not described by the grounding dependency \( B \leftarrow T \). If it were, the groundness of \( T \) and \( B \) after the execution of the compound goal \( \text{copy_term}(T, B) \), \( T = a \) would be described by \( (B \leftarrow T) \land T = T \land B \), which is incorrect. To handle \( \text{copy_term} \) accurately it is necessary to extend the fixpoint engine to ground \( B \) if \( T \) is ground when the goal is encountered.

3 The assert problem

The database mutation predicates are assert, retract and abolish. The retract and abolish builtins remove clauses from the database, cannot affect safety, and thus are not as problematic as assert. With the two program model, however, asserts can be handled safely.

3.1 Exploiting dynamic declarations

One simple tactic is based on inspecting the dynamic declarations of the program since it is normally only permissible to assert clauses whose head predicate symbols are dynamic [8]. If \( p/n \) is declared dynamic, then a (nop) clause \( p'(X_1, \ldots, X_n) \) can be added to the renamed program so as to ensure that the answer pattern calculated for \( p' \) is safe. The nop clause is a device that is introduced temporarily for analysis: it should not appear in the code generated for the renamed program. In this scheme, the assert goals in both the virgin and renamed program must be retained and the behaviour of assert (slightly) revised. Specifically, a call \( \text{assert}((H \leftarrow B_1, \ldots, B_n)) \) must both add \( H \leftarrow B_1, \ldots, B_n \) to the virgin program and add \( H' \leftarrow B_1, \ldots, B_n \) to the renamed program. This ensures consistency between the two versions of the program. The semantics of retract also needs to be amended to keep both versions of the program consistent. Note that the body atoms of both asserted clauses are not renamed and thus only generate calls into the virgin program. The asserted clauses do not therefore compromise the safety of the call and answer patterns calculated for the renamed predicates.

3.2 Exploiting principal functor information

The dynamic declarations provide a useful safety net for handling asserts. Often, however, the principal functors of all the head and body atoms of all the asserted clauses are known at compile-time. This enables asserts to be analysed without resorting to safe (albeit imprecise) nop clauses. Specifically, consider
the goal assert((H ✶ B₁, ..., Bₙ)) and suppose that the principal functors of
H, B₁, ..., Bₙ are all known (rather than, say, uninstantiated variables). Then
the H′ ✶ B₁′, ..., Bₙ′ clause can be added to the renamed program for the
purposes of analysis. As with nop clauses, the renamed clause is merely an
analysis device and should not appear in the code generated for the renamed
program. Also like before, the assert goals must be retained. With the modified
assert semantics, this again adds H ✶ B₁, ..., Bₙ to the virgin program and
H′ ✶ B₁, ..., Bₙ to the renamed program. The chief advantage of this tactic
over just exploiting dynamic declarations is that it may improve the precision
of the answer pattern of an asserted clause.

In cases where we do not have full knowledge at compile-time of all the asserted
clauses, we still need to resort to the nop tactic. Specifically, if a program
contains an assert with a clause that contains a body atom whose principle
functor is not known at compile-time, then the nop tactic has to be applied.
Similarly, if the program contains a meta-call to a goal whose principle functor
is not known, then the nop tactic has to be applied. This is because, in general,
unknown meta-calls and body atoms may take the form assert(p(X₁, ..., Xₙ))
where p/n is dynamic.

3.3 Exploiting groundness information

If the program does not need to contain nop clauses (for the reasons explained
above), then precision can be further improved by inferring the groundness
information that describes the program state at the time at which the
assert goal is encountered. Specifically, for the goal assert((H ✶ B₁, ..., Bₙ)),
the tactic is to deduce the grounding dependencies between \{X₁, ..., Xₙ\} =
\text{var}(H ✶ B₁, ..., Bₙ) at the program point at which the assert occurs. This
is achieved by inserting the call \text{p}(X₁, ..., Xₙ) into the renamed program
immediately prior to the assert goal where p/m is a new predicate symbol.
The \text{p/m} goal records the state of the X₁, ..., Xₙ variables. To ensure that
the call succeeds (without binding X₁, ..., Xₙ) the nop fact \text{p}(X₁, ..., Xₙ) is
added to the renamed program. Observe that the call and answer patterns
of \text{p/m} coincide. To model the effect of the bindings on X₁, ..., Xₙ, the
clauses \text{H′ ✶ q(X₁, ..., Xₙ), B₁′, ..., Bₙ′} and q(X₁, ..., Xₙ) ✶ \text{p(X₁, ..., Xₙ)}
are added to the renamed program where q/m is another new predicate sym-
bol. The fixpoint engine is (very slightly) modified to recognise the q/m clause
as assert related and specifically bar the \text{p}(X₁, ..., Xₙ) body atom from con-
tributing to the call pattern of \text{p/m}. Otherwise call and answer patterns arising
within the q/m are traced normally. Hence the call pattern on \text{p/m} corre-
sponds to the answer pattern on q/m which, in turn, propagates the bindings
on X₁, ..., Xₙ into the asserted clause.
4 The retract problem

As previously explained, the problem with a goal such as retract($(H : - B)$) is essentially one of precision: retract goals can be ignored but this loses the grounding effects of matching $H : - B$ against the dynamic database. An analogous problem occurs with clause($(H : - B)$) which can be interpreted as a non-mutating read of the dynamic database. If the principal functor of $H$ is known at compile-time to be $p/n$ and the (static and dynamic) clauses for $p/n$ are known to be facts, then the goals retract($H : - B$) and clause($H : - B$) can be handled as the conjunction call($H$), $B = true$. A simpler tactic is applicable for goals such as retract($H$) and clause($H$) where $H$ is bound at compile-time to a fact with a principal functor $p/n$. Both retract and clause goals can then be replaced with the call $H'$. This is safe because if the dynamic database contains a matching fact, then the answer pattern for $p/n$ will safely approximate the effect of unifying $H$ with the database.

5 Discussion

Most goals can be handled relatively straightforwardly in program analysis: compound goals such as $G_1; G_2, G_1 \rightarrow G_2$, etc can dealt with by simple program transformations; table lookup can be used for most builtns; and even catch and throw can be supported [4]. Constraints can be handled straightforwardly by re-writing to three-variable form [1]. For example, $w = x + y * z$, is written to $w = x + t, t = y * z$, where $t$ is a fresh, temporary variable. Table lookup is then used to map three-variable forms to Boolean formulae, for example $w = x + t$ and $t = y * z$ map to $f_1 = (w \leftarrow (x \land t)) \land (x \leftarrow (w \land t)) \land (t \leftarrow (w \land x))$ and $f_2 = (t \leftarrow (y \land z))$. The grounding behaviour of the constraint $w = x + t, t = y * z$ is described by $f_1 \land f_2$. (Temporary variables such as $t$ can be removed by projection, for example, $t$ can be eliminated by $\exists t. (f_1 \land f_2) = (w \leftarrow (x \land y \land z)) \land (x \leftarrow (w \land y \land z))$. However, we choose not to do this, preferring to keep the abstracter as simple as possible. This only really affects $EPos_{N}$.)

The real problem in handling builtns is that the large number of cases means that it is easy to accidently introduce some imprecision. An appendix thus details how our analyser handles various builtns. It is intended to help other developers in the analysis community. Other issues that have not be discussed in this note, however, are more problematic. For example, supporting programs that are broken across several files [4,5,9] is a study within its own right. At present, our analyser has no support for modules. It also cannot handle term mutating setarg/3 goals.
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A Groundness abstractions for builtins

In order to make the appendix containable, we give representative groundness abstractions for a range of builtins. In the sequel \(f_i\) denotes the formula \(\land\text{var}(t_i)\) where \(\text{var}(t_i)\) is the set of variables occurring in the term \(t_i\). Note that \(\land\emptyset = \text{true}\).

The following builtins ground all their arguments: \(<2\), \(>/2\), \(=\langle2\), \(>=/2\), \(=:=/2\), \(=/2\), abolish/1, abolish/2, absolute_file_name/2, atom/1, atom_chars/2, atomic/1, compile/1, consult/1, character_count/2, close/1, current_atom/1, current_input/1, current_module/1, current_module/2, current_op/3, current_output/1, current_stream/3, ensure_loaded/1, erase/1, float/1,
The following builtins are abstracted as true: \( \emptyset / 2, \emptyset > / 2, \emptyset \lneq / 2, \emptyset \geq / 2, \\lfloor / 2, \rfloor / 2, \text{break/0}, \text{callable/1}, \text{compound/1}, \text{debug/0}, \text{debugging/0}, \text{dif/2}, \text{display/1}, \text{expand_term/2}, \text{fileerrors/0}, \text{garbage_colletc/0}, \text{gc/0}, \text{help/0}, \text{listing/0}, \text{nl/0}, \text{nouser/0}, \text{nofileerrors/0}, \text{nogc/0}, \text{nonvar/1}, \text{nospf/0}, \text{notrace/0}, \text{otherwise/0}, \text{phrase/2}, \text{phrase/3}, \text{print/1}, \text{read/1}, \text{repeat/0}, \text{retractall/1}, \text{subsumechk/2}, \text{seen/0}, \text{simple/1}, \text{skip/line/0}, \text{statistics/0}, \text{told/0}, \text{true/0}, \text{ttyflush/0}, \text{ttyline/0}, \text{var/1}, \text{version/0}, \text{write/1}, \text{writeq/1}, \text{writecanonical/1}.

The following builtins are described by the bottom element of the groundness domain (usually false): abort/0, fail/0, false/0, halt/0, halt/1.

The final table details some (non-trivial) grounding dependencies.

\[
\begin{align*}
t_1 & = t_2 \ f_1 \leftrightarrow f_2 \\
t_1 & == t_2 \ f_1 \leftrightarrow f_2 \\
\text{arg}(t_1, t_2, t_3) & \ f_1 \wedge (f_3 \leftarrow f_2) \\
\text{current_predicate}(t_1, t_2) & \ f_1 \\
\text{format}(t_1, t_2) & \ f_1 \\
\text{hash_term}(t_1, t_2) & \ f_2 \\
\text{instance}(t_1, t_2) & \ f_1 \\
\text{length}(t_1, t_2) & \ f_2 \\
\text{predicate_property}(t_1, t_2) & \ f_2 \\
\text{read}(t_1, t_2) & \ f_1 \\
\text{source_file}(t_1, t_2) & \ f_2 \\
\text{writecanonical}(t_1, t_2) & \ f_1 \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
t_1 & = t_2 \ f_1 \leftrightarrow f_2 \\
C(t_1, t_2, t_3) & \ f_1 = [t_2] \\
\text{compare}(t_1, t_2, t_3) & \ f_1 \\
\text{format}(t_1, t_2) & \ f_1 \\
\text{functor}(t_1, t_2, t_3) & \ f_2 \wedge f_3 \\
\text{hash_term}(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) & \ f_2 \wedge f_3 \wedge f_4 \\
\text{keysort}(t_1, t_2) & \ f_1 \leftrightarrow f_2 \\
\text{portray_clause}(t_1, t_2) & \ f_1 \\
\text{print}(t_1, t_2) & \ f_1 \\
\text{sort}(t_1, t_2) & \ f_1 \leftrightarrow f_2 \\
\text{write}(t_1, t_2) & \ f_1 \\
\text{writeq}(t_1, t_2) & \ f_1 \\
\end{align*}
\]

For many goals, partial evaluation can be used to improve precision when the arguments of the goal are partially instantiated. For example, the unification \( f(X, Y) = f(U, V) \) can be reduced to the conjunction \( X = U, Y = V \), which, in turn, is described as \( (X \leftrightarrow U) \wedge (Y \leftrightarrow V) \) rather than \( (X \wedge Y) \leftrightarrow (U \wedge V) \). C/3 is handled by transforming the goal into an explicit unification.