


Range-Restricted and Horn Interpolation through Clausal Tableaux^{*}

Christoph Wernhard 

University of Potsdam info@christophwernhard.com

Abstract. We show how variations of range-restriction and also the Horn property can be passed from inputs to outputs of Craig interpolation in first-order logic. The proof system is clausal tableaux, which stems from first-order ATP. Our results are induced by a restriction of the clausal tableau structure, which can be achieved in general by a proof transformation, also if the source proof is by resolution/paramodulation. Primarily addressed applications are query synthesis and reformulation with interpolation. Our methodical approach combines operations on proof structures with the immediate perspective of feasible implementation through incorporating highly optimized first-order provers.

1 Introduction

We show how variations of range-restriction and also the Horn property can be passed from inputs to outputs of Craig interpolation in first-order logic. The primarily envisaged application field is synthesis and reformulation of queries with interpolation [39,56,5]. Basically, the sought target query R is understood there as the right side of a definition of a given query Q within a given background knowledge base K , i.e., it holds that $K \models (Q \leftrightarrow R)$, where the vocabulary of R is in a given set of permitted target symbols. In first-order logic, the formulas R can be characterized as the Craig interpolants of $K \wedge Q$ and $\neg K' \vee Q'$, where K, Q are copies of K', Q' with the symbols not allowed in R replaced by fresh symbols [14]. Formulas R exist if and only if the entailment $K \wedge Q \models \neg K' \vee Q'$ holds. They can be constructed as Craig interpolants from given proofs of the entailment in a suitable calculus.

In databases and knowledge representation, syntactic fragments of first-order logic ensure desirable properties, for example domain independence. Typically, for given K and Q in some such fragment, also R must be in some specific fragment to be usable as a query or as a knowledge base component. Our work addresses this by showing for certain such fragments how membership is passed on to interpolants and thus to the constructed right sides of definitions. The fragment in focus here is a variant of range-restriction from [59], known as a rather general syntactic condition to ensure domain independence [1, p. 97]. It

^{*} Funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – Project-ID 457292495. The work was supported by the North-German Supercomputing Alliance (HLRN).

permits conversion into a shape suitable for “evaluation” by binding free and quantified variables successively to the members of given predicate extensions. Correspondingly, if the vocabulary is relational, a range-restricted formula can be translated into a relational algebra expression. First-order representations of widely-used classes of integrity constraints, such as tuple-generating dependencies, are sentences that are range-restricted in the considered sense.

As proof system we use *clausal tableaux* [29,31,30,26,33], devised in the 1990s to take account of automated first-order provers that may be viewed as enumerating tree-shaped proof structures, labeled with instances of input clauses.¹ Such systems include the Prolog Technology Theorem Prover [53], SETHEO [32], leanCoP [43,42] and CProver [16,60,61,45]. As shown in [62], a *given* closed clausal tableau is quite well-suited as a proof structure to extract a Craig interpolant. Via the translation of a resolution deduction tree [12] to a clausal tableau in cut normal form [31,62] this transfers also to interpolation from a given resolution/paramodulation proof.

Since the considered notion of range-restriction is based on prenexing and properties of both a CNF and a DNF representation of the formula, it fits well with the common first-order ATP setting involving Skolemization and clausification and the ATP-oriented interpolation on the basis of clausal tableaux, where in a first stage the propositional structure of the interpolant is constructed and in a second stage the quantifier prefix.

Our strengthenings of Craig interpolation are induced by a specific restriction of the clausal tableau structure, which we call *hyper*, since it relates to the proof structure restrictions of hyperresolution [46] and hypertableaux [2]. However, it is considered here for tree structures with rigid variables. A proof transformation that converts an arbitrary closed clausal tableau to one with the hyper property shows that the restriction is w.l.o.g. and, moreover, allows the prover unhampered search for the closed clausal tableaux or resolution/paramodulation proof underlying interpolation.

Structure of the Paper. Section 2 summarizes preliminaries, in particular interpolation with clausal tableaux [62]. Our main result on strengthenings of Craig interpolation for range-restricted formulas is developed in Sect. 3. Section 4 discusses Craig interpolation from a Horn formula, also combined with range-restriction. The proof transformation underlying these results is introduced in Sect. 5. We conclude in Sect. 6 with discussing related work, open issues and perspectives.

Proofs of nontrivial claims that are not proven in the body of the paper are supplemented in the appendix. An implementation with the PIE environment [60,61]² is in progress.

¹ Alternate accounts and views are provided by model elimination [34] and the connection method [7,8].

² <http://cs.christophwernhard.com/pie>

2 Notation and Preliminaries

2.1 Notation

We consider *formulas* of first-order logic. An *NNF formula* is a quantifier-free formula built up from *literals* (atoms or negated atoms), truth-value constants \top, \perp , conjunction and disjunction. A *CNF formula*, also called *clausal formula*, is an NNF formula that is a conjunction of disjunctions (*clauses*) of literals. A *DNF formula* is an NNF formula that is a disjunction of conjunctions (*conjunctive clauses*) of literals. The complement of a literal L is denoted by \bar{L} . An occurrence of a subformula in a formula has positive (negative) *polarity*, depending on whether it is in the scope of an even (odd) number of possibly implicit occurrences of negation. Let F be a formula. $\text{Var}(F)$ is set of its free variables. $\text{Var}^+(F)$ ($\text{Var}^-(F)$) is the set of its free variables with an occurrence in an atom with positive (negative) polarity. $\text{Fun}(F)$ is the set of functions occurring in it, including constants, regarded here throughout as 0-ary functions. $\text{Pred}^\pm(F)$ is the set of pairs $\langle p, \text{pol} \rangle$, where p is a predicate and $\text{pol} \in \{+, -\}$, such that an atom with predicate p occurs in F with the polarity indicated by pol . $\text{Voc}^\pm(F)$ is $\text{Fun}(F) \cup \text{Pred}^\pm(F)$. A *sentence* is a formula without free variables. An NNF is *ground* if it has no variables. If S is a set of terms, we call its members S -terms. The \models symbol expresses semantic entailment.

2.2 Clausal First-Order Tableaux

A *clausal tableau* (briefly *tableau*) for a clausal formula F is a finite ordered tree whose nodes N with exception of the root are labeled with a literal $\text{lit}(N)$, such that for each node N the disjunction of the literals of all its children in their left-to-right order, $\text{clause}(N)$, is an instance of a clause in F . A branch of a tableau is *closed* iff it contains nodes with complementary literals. A node is *closed* iff all branches through it are closed. A tableau is *closed* iff its root is closed. A node is *closing* iff it has an ancestor with complementary literal. With a closing node N , a particular such ancestor is associated as *target of N* , written $\text{tgt}(N)$. A tableau is *regular* iff no node has an ancestor with the same literal and is *leaf-closing* iff all closing nodes are leaves. A closed tableau that is leaf-closing is called *leaf-closed*. Tableau simplification can convert any tableau to a regular and leaf-closing tableau for the same clausal formula, closed if the original tableau is so. Regularity is achieved by repeating the following operation [31, Sect. 2.1.3]: Select a node N with an ancestor that has the same literal, remove the edges originating in the parent of N and replace them with the edges originating in N . The leaf-closing property is achieved by repeatedly selecting an inner node N that is closing and removing the edges originating in N . All occurrences of variables in (the literal labels of) a tableau are free and their scope spans the whole tableau. That is, we consider *free-variable tableaux* [30, p. 158ff] with *rigid variables* [26, p. 114]. A tableau without variables is called *ground*. The universal closure of a clausal formula F is unsatisfiable iff there exists a closed clausal tableau for F . This holds also if *clausal tableau* is restricted by the properties *ground*, *regular* and *leaf-closing* in arbitrary combinations.

2.3 Interpolation with Clausal Tableaux

Craig's interpolation theorem [13,15] along with Lyndon's observation on the preservation of predicate polarities [35] ensures for first-order logic the existence of *Craig-Lyndon interpolants*, defined as follows. Let F, G be formulas such that $F \models G$. A *Craig-Lyndon interpolant* of F and G is a formula H such that (1) $F \models H$ and $H \models G$. (2) $\text{Voc}^\pm(H) \subseteq \text{Voc}^\pm(F) \cap \text{Voc}^\pm(G)$. (3) $\text{Var}(H) \subseteq \text{Var}(F) \cap \text{Var}(G)$. The perspective of validating an entailment $F \models G$ by showing unsatisfiability of $F \wedge \neg G$ is reflected in the notion of *reverse Craig-Lyndon interpolant* of F and G , defined as Craig-Lyndon interpolant of F and $\neg G$.

Following [62], our interpolant construction is based on a generalization of clausal tableaux where nodes have an additional *side* label that is shared by siblings and indicates whether the tableau clause is an instance of an input clause derived from the formula F or of the formula G of the statement $F \wedge G \models \perp$ underlying the reverse interpolant. Thus, a *two-sided clausal tableau* for clausal formulas F and G is a tableau for $F \wedge G$ whose nodes N with exception of the root are labeled additionally with a *side* $\text{side}(N) \in \{F, G\}$, such that (1) if N and N' are siblings, then $\text{side}(N) = \text{side}(N')$; (2) if N has a child N' with $\text{side}(N') = F$, then $\text{clause}(N)$ is an instance of a clause in F , and if N has a child N' with $\text{side}(N') = G$, then $\text{clause}(N)$ is an instance of a clause in G . We also refer to the side of the children of a node N as *side of clause*(N). For $\text{side} \in \{F, G\}$ define $\text{path}_{\text{side}}(N) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigwedge_{N' \in \text{Path} \text{ and } \text{side}(N') = \text{side}} \text{lit}(N')$, where Path is the union of the set of the ancestors of N and $\{N\}$.

Let N be a node of a leaf-closed two-sided clausal tableau. The value of $\text{ipol}(N)$ is an NNF formula, defined inductively as specified with the tables below, the left for the base case where N is a leaf, the right for the case where N is an inner node with children N_1, \dots, N_n .

$\text{side}(N)$	$\text{side}(\text{tgt}(N))$	$\text{ipol}(N)$	$\text{side}(N_1)$	$\text{ipol}(N)$
F	F	\perp	F	$\bigvee_{i=1}^n \text{ipol}(N_i)$
F	G	$\text{lit}(N)$	G	$\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \text{ipol}(N_i)$
G	F	$\overline{\text{lit}(N)}$		
G	G	\top		

Example 1. Figure 1 shows a two-sided tableau for $F = p(a) \wedge (\neg p(a) \vee q(a))$ and $G = (\neg q(a) \vee r(a)) \wedge \neg r(a)$. **Side G** is indicated by gray background. For each node the value of ipol , after truth-value simplification, is annotated in brackets. The clauses of the tableau are $\neg r(a)$ and $\neg q(a) \vee r(a)$, which have side G, and




Fig. 1. A two-sided clausal tableau.

$\neg p(a) \vee q(a)$ and $p(a)$, which have side F . If N is the node shown bottom left, labeled with $p(a)$, then $\text{path}_F(N) = \neg p(a) \wedge p(a)$ and $\text{path}_G(N) = \neg r(a) \wedge \neg q(a)$.

If N_0 is the root of a two-sided tableaux for clausal *ground* formulas F and G , then $\text{ipol}(N_0)$ is a Craig-Lyndon interpolant of F and $\neg G$.³ The CTIF (*Clausal Tableau Interpolation for First-Order Formulas*) procedure (Fig. 2) [62] extends this to a two-stage [9,24] (inductive construction and lifting) interpolation method for full first-order logic. It is complete (yields a Craig-Lyndon interpolant for all first order formulas F and G such that $F \models G$) under the assumption that the method for tableau computation in Step 3 is complete (yields a closed tableau for all unsatisfiable clausal formulas). Some steps leave room for interpolation-specific heuristics: In step 4 the choice of the terms used for grounding; in step 5 the choice of the side assigned to clauses that are an instance of both a clause in F' and a clause in G' ; and in step 7 the quantifier prefix, which is constrained just by a partial order.

Example 2. Let $F \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \forall x p(x) \wedge \forall x (\neg p(x) \vee q(x))$ and let $G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \forall x (\neg q(x) \vee r(x)) \rightarrow r(a)$. Clausifying F and $\neg G$ then yields $F' = p(x) \wedge (\neg p(x) \vee q(x))$ and $G' = (\neg q(x) \vee r(x)) \wedge \neg r(a)$. The tableau from Fig. 1 is a leaf-closed ground tableau for F' and G' and we obtain $q(a)$ as H_{GRD} . Lifting for $\mathcal{F} = \{\}$ and $\mathcal{G} = \{a\}$ yields the interpolant $H = \forall v_1 q(v_1)$.

Example 3. Let $F \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \forall x \forall y p(x, f(x), y)$ and let $G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \exists x p(a, x, g(x))$. Clausifying yields $F' = p(x, f(x), y)$ and $G' = \neg p(a, z, g(z))$. We obtain $p(a, f(a), g(f(a)))$ as H_{GRD} . Lifting is for $\mathcal{F} = \{f\}$ and $\mathcal{G} = \{a, g\}$ with $t_1 = a$, $t_2 = f(a)$ and $t_3 = g(f(a))$. It yields $H = \forall v_1 \exists v_2 \forall v_3 p(v_1, v_2, v_3)$.

3 Interpolation and Range-Restriction

We now develop our main result on strengthenings of Craig interpolation for range-restricted formulas.

3.1 CNF and DNF with Some Assumed Syntactic Properties

Following [59] we will consider a notion of range-restriction defined in terms of properties of two prenex formulas that are equivalent to the original formula, have both the same quantifier prefix but matrices in CNF and DNF, respectively. Although not syntactically unique, we refer to them functionally as $\text{cnf}(F)$ and $\text{dnf}(F)$ since we only rely on specific – easy to achieve – syntactic properties that are stated in the following Props. 4–6.

Proposition 4. *For all formulas F it holds that $\text{Var}(\text{cnf}(F)) \subseteq \text{Var}(F)$; $\text{Voc}^\pm(\text{cnf}(F)) \subseteq \text{Voc}^\pm(F)$; $\text{Var}(\text{dnf}(F)) \subseteq \text{Var}(F)$; $\text{Voc}^\pm(\text{dnf}(F)) \subseteq \text{Voc}^\pm(F)$.*

³ So far, the interpolation method is a variation of well-known methods for sequent systems [52,55] and analytic tableaux [20] when restricted to propositional formulas.

INPUT: First-order formulas F and G such that $F \models G$.

METHOD:

1. *Free variables to placeholder constants.* Let F_c and G_c be the sentences obtained from F and G by replacing each free variable with a dedicated fresh constant.
2. *Skolemization and clausification.* Apply there conversion to prenex form and second-order Skolemization independently to F_c and to $\neg G_c$, resulting in disjoint sets of fresh Skolem functions $\mathcal{F}', \mathcal{G}'$, clausal formulas F', G' , and sets $\mathcal{U}' = \text{Var}(F'), \mathcal{V}' = \text{Var}(G')$ of variables such that

- (a) $F_c \equiv \exists \mathcal{F}' \forall \mathcal{U}' F'$ and $\neg G_c \equiv \exists \mathcal{G}' \forall \mathcal{V}' G'$.
- (b) $\text{Voc}^\pm(F') \subseteq \text{Voc}^\pm(F_c) \cup \mathcal{F}'$ and $\text{Voc}^\pm(\neg G') \subseteq \text{Voc}^\pm(G_c) \cup \mathcal{G}'$.
- (c) $\forall \mathcal{U}' \forall \mathcal{V}' (F' \wedge G') \models \perp$.

In case F' or G' contains the empty clause, exit with result $H \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \perp$ or $H \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \top$, respectively.

3. *Tableau computation.* Compute a leaf-closed clausal tableau for the clausal formula $F' \wedge G'$. This can be obtained, for example, from a clausal tableaux prover for clausal first-order formulas.
4. *Tableau grounding.* Instantiate all variables of the tableau with ground terms built up from functions in $F' \wedge G'$ and possibly also fresh functions $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_1 \uplus \mathcal{S}_2$. Observe that the grounded tableau is still a leaf-closed tableau for $F' \wedge G'$.
5. *Side assignment.* Convert the ground tableau to a two-sided tableau for F' and G' by attaching appropriate *side* labels to all nodes except the root. This is always possible because every clause of the tableau is an instance of a clause in F' or in G' .
6. *Ground interpolant extraction.* Let H_{GRD} be the value of $\text{ipol}(N_0)$, where N_0 is the root of the tableau.
7. *Interpolant lifting.* Let $\mathcal{F} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{F}' \cup (\text{Fun}(F) \setminus \text{Fun}(G)) \cup \mathcal{S}_1$ and let $\mathcal{G} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{G}' \cup (\text{Fun}(G) \setminus \text{Fun}(F)) \cup \mathcal{S}_2$. Let \mathcal{FG} stand for $\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G}$. An \mathcal{FG} -maximal occurrence of an \mathcal{FG} -term in a formula is an occurrence that is not within another \mathcal{FG} -term. Let $\{t_1, \dots, t_n\}$ be the set of the \mathcal{FG} -terms with an \mathcal{FG} -maximal occurrence in H_{GRD} , ordered such that if t_i is a subterm of t_j , then $i < j$. Let $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ be a set of fresh variables. For $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ define the quantifiers Q_i as \exists if $t_i \in \mathcal{F}$ -terms and as \forall if $t_i \in \mathcal{G}$ -terms. Let

$$H_c \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Q_1 v_1 \dots Q_n v_n H'_{\text{GRD}},$$

where H'_{GRD} is obtained from H_{GRD} by replacing all \mathcal{FG} -maximal occurrences of terms t_i with variable v_i , simultaneously for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

8. *Placeholder constants to free variables.* Let H be H_c after replacing any constants that were introduced in step 1 with their corresponding variables.

OUTPUT: Return H , a Craig-Lyndon interpolant of the input formulas F and G .

Fig. 2. The CTIF Procedure for Craig-Lyndon Interpolation [62].

For prenex formulas F with an NNF matrix let $\text{dual}(F)$ be the formula obtained from F by switching quantifiers \forall and \exists , connectives \wedge and \vee , truth-value constants \top and \perp , and literals with their complement.

Proposition 5. *For all formulas F it holds that $\text{cnf}(F) = \text{dual}(\text{dnf}(\neg F))$; $\text{dnf}(F) = \text{dual}(\text{cnf}(\neg F))$; $\text{cnf}(\neg F) = \text{dual}(\text{dnf}(F))$; $\text{dnf}(\neg F) = \text{dual}(\text{cnf}(F))$.*

Proposition 6. *Let F_1, F_2, \dots, F_n be NNF formulas. Then (i) Each clause in $\text{cnf}(\bigwedge_{i=1}^n F_i)$ is in some $\text{cnf}(F_j)$. (ii) Each conjunctive clause in $\text{dnf}(\bigvee_{i=1}^n F_i)$ is in some $\text{dnf}(F_j)$. (iii) Formulas F_j that are literals are in each clause in $\text{cnf}(\bigwedge_{i=1}^n F_i)$. (iv) Formulas F_j that are literals are in each conjunctive clause in $\text{dnf}(\bigwedge_{i=1}^n F_i)$. (v) If S is a set of variables such that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and clauses C in $\text{cnf}(F_i)$ it holds that $\text{Var}(C) \cap S \subseteq \text{Var}^-(C)$, then for all clauses C in $\text{cnf}(\bigvee_{i=1}^n F_i)$ it holds that $\text{Var}(C) \cap S \subseteq \text{Var}^-(C)$. (vi) If S is a set of variables such that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and conjunctive clauses D in $\text{dnf}(F_i)$ it holds that $\text{Var}(D) \cap S \subseteq \text{Var}^+(D)$, then for all conjunctive clauses D in $\text{dnf}(\bigwedge_{i=1}^n F_i)$ it holds that $\text{Var}(D) \cap S \subseteq \text{Var}^+(D)$.*

3.2 Used Notions of Range-Restriction

The following definition renders the characteristics of the range-restricted formulas as considered by Van Gelder and Topor in [59, Theorem 7.2] (except for the special consideration of equality in [59]).

Definition 7. A formula F with free variables \mathcal{X} is called *VGT-range-restricted* if $\text{cnf}(F) = Q M_C$ and $\text{dnf}(F) = Q M_D$, where Q is a quantifier prefix (the same in both formulas) upon universally quantified variables \mathcal{U} and existentially quantified variables \mathcal{E} (in arbitrary order), and M_C, M_D are quantifier-free formulas in CNF and DNF, respectively, such that

1. For all clauses C in M_C it holds that $\text{Var}(C) \cap \mathcal{U} \subseteq \text{Var}^-(C)$.
2. For all conjunctive clauses D in M_D it holds that $\text{Var}(D) \cap \mathcal{E} \subseteq \text{Var}^+(D)$.
3. For all conjunctive clauses D in M_D it holds that $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Var}^+(D)$.

For VGT-range-restricted formulas it is shown in [59] that these can be translated via two intermediate formula classes to a relational algebra expression. Related earlier results include [40,41,17,18]. The constraint on universal variables is also useful on its own as a weaker variation of range-restriction, defined as follows.

Definition 8. A formula F is called *U-range-restricted* if $\text{cnf}(F) = Q M_C$ where Q is a quantifier prefix upon the universally quantified variables \mathcal{U} (there may also be existentially quantified variables in Q) and M_C is a quantifier-free formula in CNF such that for all clauses C in M_C it holds that $\text{Var}(C) \cap \mathcal{U} \subseteq \text{Var}^-(C)$.

For formulas without free variables, U-range-restriction and VGT-range-restriction are related as follows.

Proposition 9. *Let F be a sentence. Then (i) F is VGT-range-restricted iff F and $\neg F$ are both U-range-restricted. (ii) If F is universal (i.e., in prenex form with only universal quantifiers), then F is VGT-range-restricted iff F is U-range-restricted. (iii) If F is existential (i.e., in prenex form with only existential quantifiers), then F is VGT-range-restricted iff $\neg F$ is U-range-restricted.*

U-range-restriction covers well-known restrictions of knowledge bases and inputs of bottom-up calculi for first-order logic and fragments of it that are naturally represented by clausal formulas [3]. First-order representations of tuple-generating dependencies (TGDs) are VGT-range-restricted sentences: conjunctions of sentences of the form $\forall \mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y} (A(\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow \exists \mathcal{Z} B(\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{Z}))$, where A is a possibly empty conjunction of relational atoms, B is a nonempty conjunction of relational atoms and the free variables of A and B are exactly those in the sequences $\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}$ and $\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{Z}$, respectively. Also certain generalizations, e.g., to disjunctive TGDs, where B is built up from atoms, \wedge and \vee , are VGT-range-restricted.

3.3 Results on Range-Restricted Interpolation

The following theorem shows three variations for obtaining range-restricted interpolants from range-restricted inputs.

Theorem 10 (Interpolation and Range-Restriction). *Let F and G be formulas such that $F \models G$.*

(i) *If F is U-range-restricted, then there exists a U-range-restricted Craig-Lyndon interpolant H of F and G . Moreover, H can be effectively constructed from a clausal tableau proof of $F \models G$.*

(ii) *If F and G are sentences such that F and $\neg G$ are U-range-restricted, then there exists a VGT-range-restricted Craig-Lyndon interpolant H of F and G . Moreover, H can be effectively constructed from a clausal tableau proof of $F \models G$.*

(iii) *If F and $\neg G$ are U-range-restricted, $\text{Var}(F) = \text{Var}(G) = \mathcal{X}$, and (1) no clause in $\text{cnf}(F)$ has only negative literals; (2) for all clauses C in $\text{cnf}(\neg G)$ with only negative literals it holds that $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Var}^-(C)$; (3) for all clauses C in $\text{cnf}(\neg G)$ it holds that $\text{Var}(C) \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Var}^-(C)$, then there exists a VGT-range-restricted Craig-Lyndon interpolant H of F and G . Moreover, H can be effectively constructed from a clausal tableau proof of $F \models G$.*

Observe that Theorem 10.i requires range-restriction only for F , the first of the two interpolation arguments. Theorem 10.iii aims at applications for query reformulation that in a basic form are expressed as interpolation task for input formulas $F = K \wedge Q(\mathcal{X})$ and $G = \neg K' \vee Q'(\mathcal{X})$. Here K expresses background knowledge and constraints as a U-range-restricted sentence and $Q(\mathcal{X})$ represents a query to be reformulated, with free variables \mathcal{X} . Formulas K' and Q' are copies of K and Q , respectively, where predicates not allowed in the interpolant are replaced by primed versions. If the query Q is Boolean, i.e., \mathcal{X} is empty, and Q is VGT-range-restricted, then Theorem 10.ii already suffices to justify the

construction of a VGT-range-restricted interpolant. If \mathcal{X} is not empty, the fine-print preconditions of Theorem 10.iii come into play. Precondition (1) requires that $\text{cnf}(K)$ does not have a clause with only negative literals, which is satisfied if K represents TGDs. Also $\text{cnf}(Q)$ is not allowed to have a clause with only negative literals. By precondition (2) all the free variables \mathcal{X} must occur in all those clauses of $\text{cnf}(\neg Q)$ that only have negative literals, which follows if Q meets condition (3.) of the VGT-range-restriction (Def. 7). By precondition (3) for all clauses C in $\text{cnf}(\neg Q)$ it must hold that $\text{Var}(C) \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Var}^-(C)$. A sufficient condition for Q to meet all these preconditions is that $\text{dnf}(Q)$ has a purely existential quantifier prefix and a matrix with only positive literals where each query variable, i.e., member of \mathcal{X} , occurs in each conjunctive clause.

3.4 Proving Range-Restricted Interpolation – The Hyper Property

We will prove Theorem 10 by showing how the claimed interpolants can be obtained with CTIF. As a preparatory step we match items from the specification of CTIF (Fig. 2) with the constraints of range-restriction. The following notion gathers intermediate formulas and sets of symbols of CTIF.

Definition 11. An *interpolation context* is a tuple $\langle F, G, F', G', \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V} \rangle$, where F, G are formulas, F', G' are clausal formulas, \mathcal{C} is a set of constants, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} are sets of functions, and $\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}$ are sets of terms such that the following holds. (i) $F \models G$. (ii) Let F_c and G_c be F and G after replacing each free variable with a dedicated fresh constant. Let \mathcal{C} be those constants that were used there to replace a variable that occurs in both F and G . F' and G' are the matrices of $\text{cnf}(F_c)$ and of $\text{cnf}(\neg G_c)$, after replacing existentially quantified variables with Skolem terms. (iii) \mathcal{F} is the union of the set of the Skolem functions introduced for existential quantifiers of $\text{cnf}(F_c)$, the set of functions occurring in F_c but not in G_c and, possibly, further functions freshly introduced in the grounding step of CTIF. Analogously, \mathcal{G} is the union of the set of the Skolem functions introduced for $\text{cnf}(\neg G_c)$, the set of functions occurring in G_c but not in F_c , and, possibly, further functions introduced in grounding. (iv) \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{U} are the sets of all terms with outermost function symbol in \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} , respectively. (v) \mathcal{V} is $\mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{C}$.

The following statements about an interpolation context are easy to infer.

Lemma 12. Let $\langle F, G, F', G', \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V} \rangle$ be an interpolation context. Then (i) No member of \mathcal{G} occurs in F' . (ii) No member of \mathcal{F} occurs in G' . (iii) If F is U -range-restricted, then for all clauses C in F' it holds that if a variable occurs in C in a position that is not within an \mathcal{E} -term it occurs in C in a negative literal, in a position that is not within an \mathcal{E} -term. (iv) If $\neg G$ is U -range-restricted, then for all clauses C in G' it holds that if a variable occurs in C in a position that is not within an \mathcal{U} -term, it occurs in C in a negative literal, in a position that is not within an \mathcal{U} -term. (v) If G satisfies condition (3) of Theorem 10.iii, then for all clauses C in G' it holds that any member of \mathcal{C} that occurs in C in a position that is not within an \mathcal{U} -term occurs in C in a negative literal in a position that is not within an \mathcal{U} -term.

CTIF involves conversion of terms to variables at lifting (step 7) and at replacing placeholder constants (step 8). We introduce a notation to identify those terms that will be converted there to variables. It mimics the notation for the set of free variables of a formula but applies to a set of terms, those with occurrences that are “maximal” with respect to a given set S of terms, i.e., are not within another term from S . For NNF formulas F define $S\text{-Max}(F)$ as the set of S -terms that occur in F in a position other than as subterm of another S -term. Define $S\text{-Max}^+(F)$ ($S\text{-Max}^-(F)$, respectively) as the set of S -terms that occur in F in a positive (negative, respectively) literal in a position other than as subterm of another S -term. We can now conclude from Lemma 12 the following properties of instances of clauses used for interpolant construction.

Lemma 13. *Let $\langle F, G, F', G', \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V} \rangle$ be an interpolation context. Then*

- (i) *If F is U -range-restricted, then for all instances C of a clause in F' it holds that $\mathcal{V}\text{-Max}(C) \cap \mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^-(C)$.*
- (ii) *If $\neg G$ is U -range-restricted, then for all instances C of a clause in G' it holds that $\mathcal{V}\text{-Max}(C) \cap \mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^-(C)$.*
- (iii) *If condition (1) of Theorem 10.iii holds, then no instance C of a clause in F' has only negative literals.*
- (iv) *If condition (2) of Theorem 10.iii holds, then for all instances C of a clause in G' with only negative literals it holds that $C \subseteq \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^-(C)$.*
- (v) *If $\neg G$ is U -range-restricted and condition (3) of Theorem 10.iii holds, then for all instances C of a clause in G' it holds that $\mathcal{V}\text{-Max}(C) \cap \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^-(C)$.*

The following proposition adapts Props. 6.v and 6.vi to $S\text{-Max}$.

Proposition 14. *Let F_1, F_2, \dots, F_n be NNF formulas and let T be a set of terms. Then (i) If S is a set of terms such that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and clauses C in $\text{cnf}(F_i)$ it holds that $T\text{-Max}(C) \cap S \subseteq T\text{-Max}^-(C)$, then for all clauses C in $\text{cnf}(\bigvee_{i=1}^n F_i)$ it holds that $T\text{-Max}(C) \cap S \subseteq T\text{-Max}^-(C)$. (ii) If S is a set of terms such that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and conjunctive clauses D in $\text{dnf}(F_i)$ it holds that $T\text{-Max}(D) \cap S \subseteq T\text{-Max}^+(D)$, then for all conjunctive clauses D in $\text{dnf}(\bigwedge_{i=1}^n F_i)$ it holds that $T\text{-Max}(D) \cap S \subseteq T\text{-Max}^+(D)$.*

The key to obtain range-restricted interpolants from CTIF is that the tableau must have a specific form, which we call *hyper*, as it resembles proofs by hyper-resolution [46] and hypertableaux [2].

Definition 15. A clausal tableau is called *hyper* if the nodes labeled with a negative literal are exactly the leaf nodes.

While hyperresolution and related approaches, e.g., [46,36,11,2,3], consider DAG-shaped proofs with non-rigid variables, aiming at interpolant extraction we consider the hyper property for tree-shaped proofs with rigid variables. The *hyper* requirement is w.l.o.g. because arbitrary closed clausal tableaux can be converted to tableaux with the hyper property, as we will see in Sect. 5.

The proof of Theorem 10 is based on three properties that invariantly hold for all nodes, or for all inner nodes, respectively, stated in the following lemma.

Lemma 16. *Let $\langle F, G, F', G', \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V} \rangle$ be an interpolation context and assume a leaf-closed and hyper two-sided clausal ground tableau for F' and G' .*

(i) *If F is \mathcal{U} -range-restricted, then for all nodes N the property $\text{INV}_{\mathcal{C}}(N)$ defined as follows holds: $\text{INV}_{\mathcal{C}}(N) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{For all clauses } C \text{ in } \text{cnf}(\text{ipol}(N)) \text{ it holds that } \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}(C) \cap \mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^-(C) \cup \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(\text{path}_{\mathcal{F}}(N))$.*

(ii) *If $\neg G$ is \mathcal{U} -range-restricted, then for all nodes N the property $\text{INV}_{\mathcal{D}}(N)$ defined as follows holds: $\text{INV}_{\mathcal{D}}(N) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{For all conjunctive clauses } D \text{ in } \text{dnf}(\text{ipol}(N)) \text{ it holds that } \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}(D) \cap \mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(D) \cup \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(\text{path}_{\mathcal{G}}(N))$.*

(iii) *If $\neg G$ is \mathcal{U} -range-restricted and conditions (1)–(3) Theorem 10.iii hold, then for all inner nodes N the property $\text{INV}_{\mathcal{X}}(N)$ defined as follows holds: $\text{INV}_{\mathcal{X}}(N) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{For all conjunctive clauses } D \text{ in } \text{dnf}(\text{ipol}(N)) \text{ it holds that } \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(D) \cup \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(\text{path}_{\mathcal{G}}(N))$.*

Each of Lemma 16.i, 16.ii and 16.iii can be proven independently by an induction on the tableau structure, but for the same tableau, such that the properties claimed by them can be combined. In proving these three sub-lemmas it is sufficient to use their respective preconditions only to justify the application of matching sub-lemmas of Lemma 13. That lemma might thus be seen as an abstract interface that delivers everything that depends on these preconditions and is relevant for Theorem 10.

We show here the proof of Lemma 16.i. Lemma 16.ii can be proven in full analogy. The proof of Lemma 16.iii is deferred to App. A. In general, recall that the tableau in Lemma 16 is a two-sided tableau for F' and G' that is leaf-closed and hyper. Hence literal labels of leaves are negative, while those of inner nodes are positive. All tableau clauses are ground and with an associated *side* in $\{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}\}$ such that a tableau clause with side \mathcal{F} is an instance of a clause in F' and one with side \mathcal{G} is an instance of a clause in G' .

Proof (Lemma 16.i). By induction on the tableau structure.

Base case where N is a leaf. If N and $\text{tgt}(N)$ have the same side, then $\text{ipol}(N)$ is a truth value constant, hence $\mathcal{V}\text{-Max}(\text{ipol}(N)) = \emptyset$, implying $\text{INV}_{\mathcal{C}}(N)$. If N has side \mathcal{F} and $\text{tgt}(N)$ has side \mathcal{G} , then $\text{ipol}(N) = \text{lit}(N)$, which, because N is a leaf, is a negative literal. Thus $\mathcal{V}\text{-Max}(\text{ipol}(N)) = \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^-(\text{ipol}(N))$, which implies $\text{INV}_{\mathcal{C}}(N)$. If N has side \mathcal{G} and $\text{tgt}(N)$ has side \mathcal{F} , then $\text{ipol}(N) = \text{lit}(\text{tgt}(N))$, which, because N is a leaf, is a positive literal. Thus $\mathcal{V}\text{-Max}(\text{ipol}(N)) \subseteq \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(\text{path}_{\mathcal{F}}(N))$, implying $\text{INV}_{\mathcal{C}}(N)$.

Induction Step. Let N_1, \dots, N_n , where $1 \leq n$, be the children of N . Assume as induction hypothesis that for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ it holds that $\text{INV}_{\mathcal{C}}(N_i)$. Consider the case where the side of the children is \mathcal{F} . Then

$$(1) \text{ipol}(N) = \bigvee_{i=1}^n \text{ipol}(N_i).$$

Assume that $\text{INV}_{\mathcal{C}}(N)$ does not hold. Then there exists a clause K in $\text{cnf}(\text{ipol}(N))$ and a term t such that (2) $t \in \mathcal{U}$; (3) $t \in \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}(K)$; (4) $t \notin \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^-(K)$; (5) $t \notin \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(\text{path}_{\mathcal{F}}(N))$. To derive a contradiction, we first show that given (2), (4) and (5) it holds that

$$(6) \text{For all children } N' \text{ of } N: t \notin \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(\text{path}_{\mathcal{F}}(N')).$$

Statement (6) can be proven as follows. Assume to the contrary that there is a child N' of N such that $t \in \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(\text{path}_{\mathcal{F}}(N'))$. By (5) it follows that $t \in \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}(\text{lit}(N'))$ and $\text{lit}(N')$ is positive. By Lemma 13.i and (2) there is another child N'' of N such that $\text{lit}(N'')$ is negative and $t \in \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}(\text{lit}(N''))$. Since the tableau is closed, it follows from (5) that $\text{tgt}(N'')$ has side \mathbf{G} , which implies that $\text{ipol}(N'') = \text{lit}(N'')$. Hence $t \in \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}(\text{ipol}(N''))$. Since $\text{ipol}(N'')$ is a negative literal and a disjunct of $\text{ipol}(N)$, it follows from (1) and Prop. 6.iii that for all clauses C in $\text{cnf}(\text{ipol}(N))$ it holds that $t \in \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^-(C)$, contradicting assumption (4). Hence (6) must hold.

From (6), (2) and the induction hypothesis it follows that for all children N' of N and clauses C' in $\text{cnf}(\text{ipol}(N'))$ it holds that $\mathcal{V}\text{-Max}(C') \cap \{t\} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^-(C')$. Hence, by (1) and Prop. 14.i it follows that for all clauses C in $\text{cnf}(\text{ipol}(N))$ it holds that $\mathcal{V}\text{-Max}(C) \cap \{t\} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^-(C)$. This, however, contradicts our assumption of the existence of a clause K in $\text{cnf}(\text{ipol}(N))$ that satisfies (3) and (4). Hence $\text{INV}_{\mathcal{C}}(N)$ must hold.

We conclude the proof of the induction step for $\text{INV}_{\mathcal{C}}(N)$ by considering the case where the side of the children of N is \mathbf{G} . Then

- (7) $\text{ipol}(N) = \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \text{ipol}(N_i)$.
- (8) For all children N' of N : $\text{path}_{\mathcal{F}}(N) = \text{path}_{\mathcal{F}}(N')$.

$\text{INV}_{\mathcal{C}}(N)$ follows from the induction hypothesis, (8), (7) and Prop. 6.i. \square

The invariant properties of tableau nodes shown in Lemmas 16.i–16.iii apply in particular to the tableau root. We now apply this to prove Theorem 10.

Proof (Theorem 10). Interpolants with the stated properties are obtained with CTIF, assuming w.l.o.g. that the CNF computed in step 2 meets the requirement of Sect. 3.1, and that the closed clausal tableau computed in step 3 is leaf-closed and has the hyper property. That CTIF constructs a Craig-Lyndon interpolant has been shown in [62]. It remains to show the further claimed properties of the interpolant. Let $\langle F, G, F', G', \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V} \rangle$ be the interpolation context for the input formulas F and G and let N_0 be the root of the tableau computed in step 3. Since N_0 is the root, $\text{path}_{\mathcal{F}}(N_0) = \text{path}_{\mathcal{G}}(N_0) = \top$ and thus the expressions $\mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(\text{path}_{\mathcal{F}}(N_0))$ and $\mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(\text{path}_{\mathcal{G}}(N_0))$ in the specifications of $\text{INV}_{\mathcal{C}}(N_0)$, $\text{INV}_{\mathcal{D}}(N_0)$ and $\text{INV}_{\mathcal{X}}(N_0)$ all denote the empty set. The claims made in the particular sub-theorems can then be shown as follows.

(10.i) By Lemma 16.i it follows that $\text{INV}_{\mathcal{C}}(N_0)$. Hence, for all clauses C in $\text{cnf}(\text{ipol}(N_0))$ it holds that $\mathcal{V}\text{-Max}(C) \cap \mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^-(C)$. It follows that the result of the interpolant lifting (step 7) of CTIF applied to $\text{ipol}(N_0)$ is \mathcal{U} -range-restricted. Placeholder constant replacement (step 8) does not alter this.

(10.ii) As for Theorem 10.i it follows that for all clauses C in $\text{cnf}(\text{ipol}(N_0))$ it holds that $\mathcal{V}\text{-Max}(C) \cap \mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^-(C)$. By Lemma 16.ii it follows that $\text{INV}_{\mathcal{D}}(N_0)$. Hence, for all conjunctive clauses D in $\text{dnf}(\text{ipol}(N_0))$ it holds that $\mathcal{V}\text{-Max}(D) \cap \mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(D)$. It follows that the result of the interpolant lifting of CTIF applied to $\text{ipol}(N_0)$ is \mathcal{U} -range-restricted. Since F and G have no free variables, placeholder constant replacement has no effect.

(10.iii) As for Theorem 10.ii it follows that for all clauses C in $\text{cnf}(\text{ipol}(N_0))$ it holds that $\mathcal{V}\text{-Max}(C) \cap \mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^-(C)$ and for all conjunctive clauses D in $\text{dnf}(\text{ipol}(N_0))$ it holds that $\mathcal{V}\text{-Max}(D) \cap \mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(D)$. By Lemma 16.iii it follows that $\text{INV}_X(N_0)$. Hence, for all conjunctive clauses D in $\text{dnf}(\text{ipol}(N_0))$ it holds that $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(D)$. It follows that the result of the interpolant lifting of CTIF applied to $\text{ipol}(N_0)$ followed by placeholder constant replacement, now applied to \mathcal{C} , is VGT-range-restricted. \square

4 Horn Interpolation

A *Horn clause* is a clause with at most one positive literal. A *Horn formula* is built up from Horn clauses with the connectives \wedge , \exists and \forall . Horn formulas are important in countless theoretical and practical respects. Our interpolation method on the basis of clausal tableaux with the hyper property can be applied to obtain a Horn interpolant under the precondition that the first argument formula F of the interpolation problem is Horn. The following theorem makes this precise. It can be proven by an induction on the structure of a clausal tableau with the hyper property (see App. B).

Theorem 17 (Interpolation from a Horn Formula). *Let F be a Horn formula and let G be a formula such that $F \models G$. Then there exists a Craig-Lyndon interpolant H of F and G that is a Horn formula. Moreover, H can be effectively constructed from a clausal tableau proof of $F \models G$.*

An apparently weaker property than Theorem 17 has been shown in [38, § 4] with techniques from model theory: For *two* universal Horn formulas F and G there exists a universal Horn formula that is like a Craig interpolant, except that function symbols are not constrained. A *universal* Horn formula is there a prenex formula with only universal quantifiers and a Horn matrix. For CTIF, the corresponding strengthening of the interpolant to a universal formula can be read-off from the specification of interpolant lifting (step 7 in Fig. 2).

The following corollary shows that Theorem 17 can be combined with Theorem 10 to obtain interpolants that are both Horn and range-restricted.

Corollary 18 (Range-Restricted Horn Interpolants). *Theorems 10.i, 10.ii and 10.iii can be strengthened: If F is a Horn formula, then there exists a Craig-Lyndon interpolant H with the properties shown in the respective theorem and the additional property that it is Horn. Moreover, H can be effectively constructed from a clausal tableau proof of $F \models G$.*

Proof. Can be shown by combining the proof of Theorem 10.i, 10.ii and 10.iii, respectively, with the proof of interpolation from a Horn sentence, Theorem 17. The combined proofs are based on inductions on the same closed tableau with the hyper property. \square

5 Obtaining Proofs with the Hyper Property

Our new interpolation theorems, Theorems 10 and 17, depend on the hyper property of the underlying closed clausal tableaux from which interpolants are extracted. We present a proof transformation that converts any closed clausal tableau to one with the hyper property. The transformation can be applied to a clausal tableau as obtained directly from a clausal tableaux prover. Moreover, it can be also be indirectly applied to a resolution proof. To this end, the resolution deduction *tree* [12] of the binary resolution proof is first translated to a closed clausal ground tableau in *cut normal form* [31, Sect. 7.2.2]. There the inner clauses are atomic cuts, tautologies of the form $\neg p(t_1, \dots, t_n) \vee p(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ or $p(t_1, \dots, t_n) \vee \neg p(t_1, \dots, t_n)$, corresponding to literals upon which a (tree) resolution step has been performed. Clauses of nodes whose children are leaves are instances of input clauses. Our hyper conversion can then be applied to the tableau in cut normal form. It is easy to see that a regular leaf-closed tableau with the hyper property can not have atomic cuts. Hence the conversion might be viewed as an elimination method for these cuts.

We specify the hyper conversion in Fig. 3 as a procedure that destructively manipulates a tableau. A *fresh copy* of an ordered tree T is there an ordered tree T' with fresh nodes and edges, related to T through a bijection c such that any node N of T has the same labels (literal label and side label) as node $c(N)$ of T' and such that the i -th edge originating in node N of T ends in node M if and only if the i -th edge originating in node $c(N)$ of T' ends in node $c(M)$. The procedure is performed as an iteration that in each round chooses an inner node with negative literal label and then modifies the tableau. Hence, at termination there is no inner node with negative literal, which means that the tableau is hyper. Termination of the procedure can be shown with a measure that strictly decreases in each round (Prop. 20 in App. C). Figures 4 and 5 show example applications of the procedure.

Since the hyper conversion procedure copies parts of subtrees it is not a polynomial operation.⁴ To get an idea of its practical feasibility, we experimented with an unbiased set of proofs of miscellaneous problems. For this we took those 112 *CASC-J11* [54] problems that could be proven with *Prover9* [37] in 400 s per problem, including a basic proof conversion with *Prover9*'s tool *Prooftrans*.⁵ The hyper conversion succeeded on 107 (or 96%) of these, given 400 s timeout per proof, where the actual median of used time was only 0.01 s. It was applied to a tableau in cut normal form that represents the proof tree of *Prover9*'s proof. The two intermediate steps, translation of paramodulation to binary resolution and expansion to cut normal form, succeeded in fractions of a second, except for one case where the expansion took 121 s and two cases where it failed due to memory exhaustion. The hyper conversion then failed in three further cases.

⁴ A thorough complexity analysis should take calculus- or strategy-dependent properties of the input proofs into account. And possibly also the blow-up from resolution to tree resolution underlying the cut normal form tableaux.

⁵ On a Linux notebook with 12th Gen Intel[®] Core™ i7-1260P CPU and 32 GB RAM.

INPUT: A closed clausal tableau.

METHOD: Simplify the tableau to leaf-closing and regular form (Sect. 2.2). Repeat the following operations until the resulting tableau is hyper.

1. Let N' be the first node visited in pre-order with a child that is an inner node with a negative literal label. Let N be the leftmost such child.
2. Create a fresh copy U of the subtree rooted at N' . In U remove the edges that originate in the node corresponding to N .
3. Replace the edges originating in N' with the edges originating in N .
4. For each leaf descendant M of N' with $\text{lit}(M) = \overline{\text{lit}(N)}$: Create a fresh copy U' of U . Change the origin of the edges originating in the root of U' to M .
5. Simplify the tableau to leaf-closing and regular form (Sect. 2.2).

OUTPUT: A leaf-closed, regular and hyper clausal tableau whose clauses are clauses of the input tableau.

Fig. 3. The *hyper conversion* proof transformation procedure.




Fig. 4. Hyper conversion of a closed clausal tableau in two rounds.




Fig. 5. Hyper conversion of a closed clausal tableau in cut normal form in two rounds. For each round the result after procedure steps 1–4 is shown and then the result after step 5, simplification, applied here to achieve regularity.

For all except two proofs the hyper conversion reduced the proof size, where the overall median of the size ratio hyper-to-input was 0.39. See App. D for details.

6 Conclusion

We conclude with discussing related work, open issues and perspectives. Our interpolation method CTIF [62] is complete for first-order logic with function symbols. Vampire’s native interpolation [23,22], targeted at verification, is like all local methods incomplete [28]. Princess [47,10] implements interpolation with a sequent calculus that supports theories for verification and permits uninterpreted predicates and functions. Suitable proofs for our approach can currently be obtained from CProver (clausal tableaux) and Prover9 (resolution/paramodulation). With optimized settings, Vampire [27] and E [49] as of today only output proofs with gaps. This seems to improve [48] or might be overcome by re-proving with Prover9 using lemmas from the more powerful systems.

So far we did not address special handling of equality in the context of range-restriction, a topic on its own, e.g., [59,3]. We treat it as predicate, with axioms for reflexivity, symmetry, transitivity and substitutivity. CTIF works smoothly with these, respecting polarity constraints of equality in interpolants [62, Sect. 10.4]. With exception of reflexivity these axioms are U-range-restricted. We do not interfere with the provers’ equality handling and just translate in finished proofs paramodulation into binary resolution with substitutivity axioms.

The potential bottleneck of conversion to clausal form in CTIF may be remedied with structure-preserving (aka *definitional*) normal forms [50,58,19,44].

Our *hyper* property might be of interest for proof presentation and exchange, since it gives the proof tree a constrained shape and in experiments often shortens it. Like hyperresolution and hypertableaux it can be generalized to take a “semantics” into account [51] [12, Chap. 6] [26, Sect. 4.5]. To shorten interpolants, it might be combined with proof reductions (e.g., [63]).

For query reformulation, interpolation on the basis of general first-order ATP was so far hardly considered. Most methods are sequent calculi [56,6] or analytic tableaux systems [21,25,5,57]. Experiments with ATP systems and propositional inputs indicate that requirements are quite different from those in verification [4]. An implemented system [25,57] uses analytic tableaux with dedicated refinements for enumerating alternate proofs/interpolants corresponding to query plans for heuristic choice. In [5] the focus is on interpolants that are sentences respecting binding patterns, which, like range-restriction, ensures database evaluability. Our interpolation theorems show fine-grained conditions for passing variations of range-restriction and the Horn property on to interpolants. Matching these with the many formula classes considered in knowledge representation and databases is an issue for future work. A further open topic is adapting recent synthesis techniques for nested relations [6] to the clausal tableaux proof system.

Methodically, we exemplified a way to approach operations on proof structures while taking efficient automated first-order provers into account. Feasible implementations are brought within reach, for practical application and also for

validating abstract claims and conjectures with scrutiny. The prover is a black box, given freedom on optimizations, strategy and even calculus. For interfacing, the overall setting incorporates clausification and Skolemization. Requirements on the proof structure do not hamper proof search, but are ensured by transformations applied to proofs returned by the efficient systems.

Acknowledgments. The author thanks Michael Benedikt for bringing the subtleties of range-restriction in databases to attention, Cécilia Pradic for insights into subtleties of proof theory, and anonymous reviewers for helpful suggestions to improve the presentation.

References

1. Abiteboul, S., Hull, R., Vianu, V.: Foundations of Databases. Addison Wesley (1995)
2. Baumgartner, P., Furbach, U., Niemelä, I.: Hyper tableaux. In: Alferes, J.J., Pereira, L.M., Orłowska, E. (eds.) JELIA'96. LNCS (LNAI), vol. 1126, pp. 1–17. Springer (1996). https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-61630-6_1
3. Baumgartner, P., Schmidt, R.A.: Blocking and other enhancements for bottom-up model generation methods. *J. Autom. Reasoning* **64**, 197–251 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/11814771_11
4. Benedikt, M., Kostylev, E.V., Mogavero, F., Tsamoura, E.: Reformulating queries: Theory and practice. In: Sierra, C. (ed.) IJCAI 2017. pp. 837–843. *ijcai.org* (2017). <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2017/116>
5. Benedikt, M., Leblay, J., ten Cate, B., Tsamoura, E.: Generating Plans from Proofs: The Interpolation-based Approach to Query Reformulation. Morgan & Claypool (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-01856-5>
6. Benedikt, M., Pradic, C., Wernhard, C.: Synthesizing nested relational queries from implicit specifications. In: PODS '23. pp. 33–45 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3584372.3588653>
7. Bibel, W.: Automated Theorem Proving. Vieweg, Braunschweig (1982). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-322-90102-6>, second edition 1987
8. Bibel, W., Otten, J.: From Schütte's formal systems to modern automated deduction. In: Kahle, R., Rathjen, M. (eds.) The Legacy of Kurt Schütte, chap. 13, pp. 215–249. Springer (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-49424-7_13
9. Bonacina, M.P., Johansson, M.: On interpolation in automated theorem proving. *J. Autom. Reasoning* **54**(1), 69–97 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10817-014-9314-0>
10. Brillout, A., Kroening, D., Rümmer, P., Wahl, T.: Beyond quantifier-free interpolation in extensions of presburger arithmetic. In: Jhala, R., Schmidt, D. (eds.) VMCAI 2011. pp. 88–102. Springer (2011). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-18275-4_8
11. Bry, F., Yahya, A.H.: Positive unit hyperresolution tableaux and their application to minimal model generation. *J. Autom. Reasoning* **25**(1), 35–82 (2000). <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006291616338>
12. Chang, C.L., Lee, R.C.T.: Symbolic Logic and Automated Theorem Proving. Academic Press (1973)

13. Craig, W.: Linear reasoning. A new form of the Herbrand-Gentzen theorem. *J. Symb. Log.* **22**(3), 250–268 (1957). <https://doi.org/10.2307/2963593>
14. Craig, W.: Three uses of the Herbrand-Gentzen theorem in relating model theory and proof theory. *J. Symb. Log.* **22**(3), 269–285 (1957). <https://doi.org/10.2307/2963594>
15. Craig, W.: The road to two theorems of logic. *Synthese* **164**(3), 333–339 (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-008-9353-3>
16. Dahn, I., Wernhard, C.: First order proof problems extracted from an article in the Mizar mathematical library. In: Bonacina, M.P., Furbach, U. (eds.) FTP’97. pp. 58–62. RISC-Linz Report Series No. 97–50, Joh. Kepler Univ., Linz (1997), <https://www.logic.at/ftp97/papers/dahn.pdf>
17. Demolombe, R.: Syntactical characterization of a subset of domain independent formulas. Tech. rep., ONERA-CERT, Toulouse (1982)
18. Demolombe, R.: Syntactical characterization of a subset of domain independent formulas. *JACM* **39**, 71–94 (1992). <https://doi.org/10.1145/147508.147520>
19. Eder, E.: An implementation of a theorem prover based on the connection method. In: Bibel, W., Petkoff, B. (eds.) AIMSA’84. pp. 121–128. North-Holland (1985)
20. Fitting, M.: *First-Order Logic and Automated Theorem Proving*. Springer, 2nd edn. (1995). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-2360-3>
21. Franconi, E., Kerhet, V., Ngo, N.: Exact query reformulation over databases with first-order and description logics ontologies. *JAIR* **48**, 885–922 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.4058>
22. Hoder, K., Holzer, A., Kovács, L., Voronkov, A.: Vinter: A Vampire-based tool for interpolation. In: Jhala, R., Igarashi, A. (eds.) APLAS 2012. LNCS, vol. 7705, pp. 148–156. Springer (2012). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-35182-2_11
23. Hoder, K., Kovács, L., Voronkov, A.: Interpolation and symbol elimination in Vampire. In: Giesl, J., Hähnle, R. (eds.) IJCAR 2010. LNCS, vol. 6173, pp. 188–195. Springer (2010). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-14203-1_16
24. Huang, G.: Constructing Craig interpolation formulas. In: Du, D.Z., Li, M. (eds.) COCOON ’95. LNCS, vol. 959, pp. 181–190. Springer (1995). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0030832>
25. Hudek, A., Toman, D., Wedell, G.: On enumerating query plans using analytic tableau. In: Nivelle, H.D. (ed.) TABLEAUX 2015. LNCS (LNAI), vol. 9323, pp. 339–354. Springer (2015). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-24312-2_23
26. Hähnle, R.: Tableaux and related methods. In: Robinson, A., Voronkov, A. (eds.) *Handb. of Autom. Reasoning*, vol. 1, chap. 3, pp. 101–178. Elsevier (2001). <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-044450813-3/50005-9>
27. Kovács, L., Voronkov, A.: First-order theorem proving and VAMPIRE. In: Sharygina, N., Veith, H. (eds.) CAV 2013. LNCS, vol. 8044, pp. 1–35. Springer (2013). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-39799-8_1
28. Kovács, L., Voronkov, A.: First-order interpolation and interpolating proof systems. In: Eiter, T., Sands, D. (eds.) LPAR-21. EPiC, vol. 46, pp. 49–64. EasyChair (2017). <https://doi.org/10.29007/1qb8>
29. Letz, R.: Clausal tableaux. In: Bibel, W., Schmitt, P.H. (eds.) *Automated Deduction – A Basis for Applications*, vol. I, pp. 43–72. Kluwer Academic Publishers (1998)
30. Letz, R.: First-order tableau methods. In: D’Agostino, M., Gabbay, D.M., Hähnle, R., Posegga, J. (eds.) *Handb. of Tableau Methods*, pp. 125–196. Kluwer Academic Publishers (1999). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-1754-0_3

31. Letz, R.: Tableau and Connection Calculi. Structure, Complexity, Implementation. Habilitationsschrift, TU München (1999), available from <http://www2.tcs.ifi.lmu.de/~letz/habil.ps>, accessed Jul 19, 2023
32. Letz, R., Schumann, J., Bayerl, S., Bibel, W.: SETHEO: A high-performance theorem prover. *J. Autom. Reasoning* **8**(2), 183–212 (1992). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00244282>
33. Letz, R., Stenz, G.: Model elimination and connection tableau procedures. In: Robinson, A., Voronkov, A. (eds.) *Handb. of Autom. Reasoning*, vol. 1, pp. 2015–2114. Elsevier (2001)
34. Loveland, D.W.: *Automated Theorem Proving: A Logical Basis*. North-Holland, Amsterdam (1978)
35. Lyndon, R.: An interpolation theorem in the predicate calculus. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* **9**, 129–142 (1959). <https://doi.org/10.2140/pjm.1959.9.129>
36. Manthey, R., Bry, F.: SATCHMO: A theorem prover implemented in Prolog. In: Lusk, E., Overbeek, R. (eds.) *CADE-9. LNCS*, vol. 310, pp. 415–434. Springer (1988). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0012847>
37. McCune, W.: Prover9 and Mace4 (2005–2010), <http://www.cs.unm.edu/~mccune/prover9>, accessed Jul 19, 2023
38. McNulty, G.F.: Fragments of first order logic, I: Universal Horn logic. *J. Symb. Log.* **42**(2), 221–237 (1977). <https://doi.org/10.2307/2272123>
39. Nash, A., Segoufin, L., Vianu, V.: Views and queries: Determinacy and rewriting. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.* **35**(3), 1–41 (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1145/1806907.1806913>
40. Nicolas, J.M.: Logics for improving integrity checking in relational data bases. Tech. rep., ONERA-CERT, Toulouse (1979)
41. Nicolas, J.M.: Logics for improving integrity checking in relational data bases. *Acta Informatica* **18**(3), 227–253 (1982). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00263192>
42. Otten, J.: Restricting backtracking in connection calculi. *AI Communications* **23**(2-3), 159–182 (2010). <https://doi.org/10.3233/AIC-2010-0464>
43. Otten, J., Bibel, W.: leanCoP: lean connection-based theorem proving. *J. Symb. Comput.* **36**(1-2), 139–161 (2003). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0747-7171\(03\)00037-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0747-7171(03)00037-3)
44. Plaisted, D.A., Greenbaum, S.: A structure-preserving clause form translation. *J. Symb. Comput.* **2**, 293–304 (1986). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0747-7171\(86\)80028-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0747-7171(86)80028-1)
45. Rawson, M., Wernhard, C., Zombori, Z., Bibel, W.: Lemmas: Generation, selection, application. In: Ramanayake, R., Urban, J. (eds.) *TABLEAUX 2023*. pp. 153–174. LNAI (2023). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-43513-3_9
46. Robinson, J.A.: Automatic deduction with hyper-resolution. *Int. J. Computer Mathematics* **1**(3), 227–234 (1965)
47. Rümmer, P.: A constraint sequent calculus for first-order logic with linear integer arithmetic. In: Cervesato, I., Veith, H., Voronkov, A. (eds.) *LPAR 2008. LNCS*, vol. 5330, pp. 274–289. Springer (2008). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-89439-1_20
48. Schulz, S.: Credo quia absurdum (?) – proof generation and challenges of proof generation. In: *PAMLTP/DG4D³* (2023), workshop presentation, https://europroofnet.github.io/_pages/WG5/Prague23/pres/Schulz.pdf
49. Schulz, S., Cruanes, S., Vukmirović, P.: Faster, higher, stronger: E 2.3. In: Fontaine, P. (ed.) *CADE 27*. pp. 495–507. No. 11716 in LNAI, Springer (2019). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-29436-6_29

50. Scott, D.: A decision method for validity of sentences in two variables. *J. Symb. Log.* **27**(4), 477 (1962)
51. Slagle, J.R.: Automatic theorem proving with renamable and semantic resolution. *JACM* **14**(4), 687–697 (1967). <https://doi.org/10.1145/321420.321428>
52. Smullyan, R.M.: *First-Order Logic*. Springer (1968), also republished with corrections by Dover publications, 1995
53. Stickel, M.E.: A Prolog technology theorem prover: implementation by an extended Prolog compiler. *J. Autom. Reasoning* **4**(4), 353–380 (1988). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00297245>
54. Sutcliffe, G., Desharnais, M.: The 11th IJCAR Automated Theorem Proving System Competition – CASC-J11. *AI Communications* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.3233/AIC-220244>
55. Takeuti, G.: *Proof Theory*. North-Holland, second edn. (1987)
56. Toman, D., Weddell, G.: *Fundamentals of Physical Design and Query Compilation*. Morgan & Claypool (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-01881-7>
57. Toman, D., Weddell, G.: An interpolation-based compiler and optimizer for relational queries (system design report). In: Eiter, T., Sands, D., Sutcliffe, G., Voronkov, A. (eds.) *IWIL 2017 Workshop and LPAR-21 Short Presentations*. Kalpa, vol. 1. EasyChair (2017). <https://doi.org/10.29007/53fk>
58. Tseitin, G.S.: On the complexity of derivation in propositional calculus. In: Slisenko, A.O. (ed.) *Studies in Constructive Mathematics and Mathematical Logic*, vol. Part II, pp. 115–125. Steklov Mathematical Institute (1970)
59. Van Gelder, A., Topor, R.W.: Safety and translation of relational calculus queries. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.* **16**(2), 235–278 (1991). <https://doi.org/10.1145/114325.103712>
60. Wernhard, C.: The PIE system for proving, interpolating and eliminating. In: Fontaine, P., Schulz, S., Urban, J. (eds.) *PAAR 2016*. *CEUR Workshop Proc.*, vol. 1635, pp. 125–138. CEUR-WS.org (2016), <http://ceur-ws.org/Vol-1635/paper-11.pdf>
61. Wernhard, C.: Facets of the PIE environment for proving, interpolating and eliminating on the basis of first-order logic. In: Hofstedt, P., et al. (eds.) *DECLARE 2019, Revised Selected Papers*. *LNCS (LNAI)*, vol. 12057, pp. 160–177. Springer (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46714-2_11
62. Wernhard, C.: Craig interpolation with clausal first-order tableaux. *J. Autom. Reasoning* **65**(5), 647–690 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10817-021-09590-3>
63. Wernhard, C., Bibel, W.: Learning from Łukasiewicz and Meredith: Investigations into proof structures. In: Platzer, A., Sutcliffe, G. (eds.) *CADE 28*. *LNCS (LNAI)*, vol. 12699, pp. 58–75. Springer (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-79876-5_4
64. Wielemaker, J., Schrijvers, T., Triska, M., Lager, T.: *SWI-Prolog*. *Theory Pract. Log. Program.* **12**(1-2), 67–96 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1471068411000494>

A Proof of Lemma 16.iii

This appendix supplements Sect. 3.4 with the proof of Lemma 16.iii, used for proving Theorem 10.iii on range-restricted interpolation with free variables.

Lemma 16. *Let $\langle F, G, F', G', \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V} \rangle$ be an interpolation context and assume a leaf-closed and hyper two-sided clausal ground tableau for F' and G' .*

(iii) *If $\neg G$ is U -range-restricted and conditions (1)–(3) Theorem 10.iii hold, then for all inner nodes N the property $\text{INV}_X(N)$ defined as follows holds: $\text{INV}_X(N) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{For all conjunctive clauses } D \text{ in } \text{dnf}(\text{ipol}(N)) \text{ it holds that } \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(D) \cup \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(\text{path}_G(N))$.*

The proof of Lemma 16.iii proceeds by induction on the tableau structure, referring to DNF conversions of the interpolant constituents, similarly to the proof of Lemma 16.ii, but with a base case that resides on the following lemma:

Lemma 19. *For all inner nodes N of a closed tableau that is hyper it holds that either all literals in $\text{clause}(N)$ are negative or N has a descendant N' such that all literals in $\text{clause}(N')$ are negative.*

Proof. The tableau is hyper, hence leaves are exactly the nodes with a negative literal label. Failure of the claimed property would imply that the tableau has an infinite branch. \square

Proof (Lemma 16.iii). By induction on the tableau structure, with nodes N where all literals in $\text{clause}(N)$ are negative as base case. That this is sufficient as base case to show $\text{INV}_X(N)$ for all inner nodes N as claimed follows from Lemma 19.

Base case where all literals in $\text{clause}(N)$ are negative. By Lemma 13.iii the children of N have side G . Hence

$$(1) \text{ ipol}(N) = \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \text{ ipol}(N_i).$$

For all children N' of N where the side of $\text{tgt}(N')$ is F it holds that $\text{ipol}(N') = \text{lit}(\text{tgt}(N'))$, a positive literal, hence $\mathcal{V}\text{-Max}(\text{lit}(N')) = \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(\text{ipol}(N'))$. For all children N' of N where the side of $\text{tgt}(N')$ is G it holds that $\mathcal{V}\text{-Max}(\text{lit}(N')) \subseteq \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(\text{path}_G(N))$. With (1) it follows that

$$(2) \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}(\text{clause}(N)) \subseteq \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(\text{ipol}(N)) \cup \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(\text{path}_G(N)).$$

By Lemma 13.iv it holds that $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}(\text{clause}(N))$. With (2) it follows that

$$(3) \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(\text{ipol}(N)) \cup \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(\text{path}_G(N)).$$

Because $\text{ipol}(N)$ is a conjunction of literals and \top , the formula $\text{dnf}(\text{ipol}(N))$ consists of a single conjunctive clause D , which contains exactly the literals in $\text{ipol}(N)$ and thus satisfies $\mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(D) = \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(\text{ipol}(N))$. Together with (3) this implies $\text{INV}_X(N)$.

Induction Step. Let N_1, \dots, N_n , where $1 \leq n$, be the children of N . Assume as induction hypothesis that for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ it holds that $\text{INV}_X(N_i)$. Consider the case where the side of the children is G . Then

$$(4) \text{ ipol}(N) = \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \text{ipol}(N_i).$$

Assume that $\text{INV}_X(N)$ does not hold. Then there exists a conjunctive clause K in $\text{dnf}(\text{ipol}(N))$ and a term t such that

- (5) $t \in \mathcal{C}$.
- (6) $t \notin \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(K)$.
- (7) $t \notin \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(\text{path}_{\mathcal{G}}(N))$.

To derive a contradiction, we first show that given (5)–(7) it holds that

$$(8) \text{ For all children } N' \text{ of } N: t \notin \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(\text{path}_{\mathcal{G}}(N')).$$

Statement (8) can be shown as follows. Assume to the contrary that there is a child N' of N such that $t \in \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(\text{path}_{\mathcal{G}}(N'))$. By (7) it follows that $t \in \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}(\text{lit}(N'))$ and $\text{lit}(N')$ is positive. By Lemma 13.v and (5) there is another child N'' of N such that $\text{lit}(N'')$ is negative and $t \in \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}(\text{lit}(N''))$. Since the tableau is closed, it follows from (7) that $\text{tgt}(N'')$ has side F, which implies that $\text{ipol}(N'') = \text{lit}(\text{tgt}(N''))$. Hence $t \in \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}(\text{ipol}(N''))$. Since $\text{ipol}(N'')$ is a positive literal and a conjunct of $\text{ipol}(N)$, it follows from (9) and Prop. 6.iv that for all conjunctive clauses D in $\text{dnf}(\text{ipol}(N))$ it holds that $t \in \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(D)$, contradicting assumption (6). Hence (8) must hold.

From (8), (5) and the induction hypothesis it follows that for all children N' of N and conjunctive clauses D' in $\text{dnf}(\text{ipol}(N'))$ it holds that $t \in \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(D')$. Hence, by (4) and Prop. 14.ii it follows that for all clauses D in $\text{dnf}(\text{ipol}(N))$ it holds that $t \in \mathcal{V}\text{-Max}^+(D)$. This, however, contradicts our assumption of the existence of a conjunctive clause K in $\text{dnf}(\text{ipol}(N))$ that satisfies (6). Hence $\text{INV}_X(N)$ must hold.

We conclude the proof of the induction step for $\text{INV}_X(N)$ by considering the case where the side of the children of N is F. Then

- (9) $\text{ipol}(N) = \bigvee_{i=1}^n \text{ipol}(N_i)$.
- (10) For all children N' of N : $\text{path}_{\mathcal{G}}(N) = \text{path}_{\mathcal{G}}(N')$.

$\text{INV}_X(N)$ follows from the induction hypothesis, (10), (9) and Prop. 6.ii. \square

B Proof of Theorem 17

This appendix supplements Sect. 4 with a proof of the central claim there, Theorem 17.

Theorem 17 (Interpolation from a Horn Formula). *Let F be a Horn formula and let G be a formula such that $F \models G$. Then there exists a Craig-Lyndon interpolant H of F and G that is a Horn formula. Moreover, H can be effectively constructed from a clausal tableau proof of $F \models G$.*

Proof. We use some additional terminology: A *negative clause* is a clause with only negative literals. A *Horn-like formula* is an NNF inductively defined as a literal, \top , \perp , a conjunction of Horn-like formulas, or a disjunction of negative

literals, \perp and at most one Horn-like formula. It is easy to see that a Horn-like formula can be converted to an equivalent conjunction of Horn clauses by truth-value simplification and distributing disjunction upon conjunction.

The claimed Horn interpolant is obtained via CTIF (Fig. 2), assuming w.l.o.g. that the CNF computed in step 2 there meets the requirement of Sect. 3.1, and that the closed clausal tableau computed in step 3 is leaf-closed and has the hyper property. That CTIF constructs a Craig-Lyndon interpolant has been shown in [62]. It remains to show that it can be converted to a Horn formula. Let $\langle F, G, F', G' \rangle$ be the prefix of an interpolation context for the input formulas F and G and let N_0 be the root of the tableau computed in step 3.

We now show by induction on the tableau structure that $H_{\text{GRD}} = \text{ipol}(N_0)$ for the tableau root N_0 is a Horn-like formula. The theorem then follows since we can obtain the final interpolant H from H_{GRD} by interpolant lifting (step 7 of CTIF), replacing placeholder constants with free variables (step 8), and conversion of the Horn-like matrix to an equivalent conjunction of Horn clauses, where all syntactic properties relevant for a Craig-Lyndon interpolant are preserved.

For the base case where N is a leaf it is immediate from the definition of ipol that $\text{ipol}(N)$ is a ground literal or a truth value constant and thus a Horn-like formula. To show the induction step, let N be an inner node with children N_1, \dots, N_n where $n \geq 1$. As induction hypothesis assume that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ it holds that $\text{ipol}(N_i)$ is a Horn-like formula. We prove the induction step by showing that then also $\text{ipol}(N)$ is a Horn-like formula.

- Case $\text{side}(N_1) = \text{F}$. We consider two subcases.
 - Case $\text{clause}(N)$ is negative. For all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ the formula $\text{ipol}(N_i)$ is a negative literal or \perp . Hence $\text{ipol}(N) = \bigvee_{i=1}^n \text{ipol}(N_i)$ is Horn-like.
 - Case $\text{clause}(N)$ is not negative. Since F' is Horn and $\text{clause}(N)$ is an instance of a clause in F' , $\text{clause}(N)$ has exactly one child whose literal label is positive. Let N_j with $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ be that child. By the induction hypothesis $\text{ipol}(N_j)$ is Horn-like. For all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{j\}$ the formula $\text{ipol}(N_i)$ is a negative literal or \perp . Hence $\text{ipol}(N) = \bigvee_{i=1}^n \text{ipol}(N_i)$ is Horn-like.
- Case $\text{side}(N_1) = \text{G}$. From the induction hypothesis it follows that $\text{ipol}(N) = \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \text{ipol}(N_i)$ is Horn-like. \square

C Termination of the Hyper Conversion

This appendix supplements Sect. 5 with a proven statement on the termination of the hyper conversion procedure (Fig. 3).

Proposition 20. *The hyper conversion procedure (Fig. 3) terminates.*

Proof. We give a measure that strictly decreases in each round of the procedure. Consider a single round of the steps 1–5 of the procedure with N and N' as determined in step 1. We observe the following.

- (i) All tableau modifications made in the round are in the subtree rooted at N' .

- (ii) At finishing the round all descendants of N' with the same literal label as N are leaves.
- (iii) All literal labels of inner nodes that are descendants of N' and are different from $\overline{\text{lit}(N)}$ at finishing the round were already literal labels of inner nodes that are descendants of N' when entering the round.

We can now specify the measure that strictly decreases in each round of the procedure. For a node N define $\text{bad-literals}(N)$ as the set of literal labels that occur in inner (i.e., non-leaf) descendants of N and are negative. From the above observations (ii) and (iii) it follows that for N' as determined in step 1 of the procedure the cardinality of $\text{bad-literals}(N')$ is strictly decreased in a round of steps 1–5 of the procedure. However, a different node might be determined as N' in step 1 of the next round. To specify a globally decreasing measure we define a further auxiliary notion: Let N_n be a node whose ancestors are in root-to-leaf order the nodes N_1, \dots, N_{n-1} . Define $\text{path-string}(N_n)$ as the string $I_1 \dots I_n \omega$ of numbers, where for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ the number I_i is the number of right siblings of N_i . With observation (i) it then follows that the following string of numbers, determined in step 1 of a round, is strictly reduced from round to round w.r.t. the lexicographical order of strings of numbers:

$$\text{path-string}(N') | \text{bad-literals}(N') |.$$

Regularity ensures that the length of the strings to be considered can not be larger than the finite number of literal labels of nodes of the input tableau plus 3 (a leading 0 for the root, which has no literal label; ω ; and $|\text{bad-literals}(N')|$). With the lexicographical order restricted to strings up to that length we have a well-order and the strict reduction ensures termination. \square

D Experimental Indicators of Practical Feasibility

This appendix supplements Sect. 5 with details on the experiments to verify practical feasibility of proof conversions involved in our strengthened variations of Craig interpolation. Also instructions for reproducing the experiments are given. An implementation of the techniques from the paper is currently in progress, written in SWI-Prolog [64], embedded in PIE [60,61]. Core parts of the functionality are already available⁶ but not yet integrated into full application workflows.

The involved proof transformations lead from a proof with resolution and paramodulation via pure binary resolution and a clausal tableau in cut normal form to a clausal tableau with the hyper property. To get an impression of their practical feasibility, we tested them on problems from the latest *CASC* competition, *CASC-J11* [54], as an unbiased set of proofs of miscellaneous problems.

As basis we took those FOF problems of *CASC-J11* on which Prover9 succeeded in the competition. We tried to reprove these in Prover9's default *auto*

⁶ Interpolation with the CTIF method (PIE module *craigtask_cm*); resolution proof translation and hyper conversion (module *ctrp*); conversion of VGT-range-restricted formulas to *allowed* [59] formulas (module *rr_support*)

mode⁷ via PIE and to convert their proofs with the `Prooftrans` tool, which comes with `Prover9`, with a timeout of 400 s per problem.⁸ `Prooftrans` was configured with the `expand` option that translates `Prover9`'s proofs to just binary resolution, paramodulation and a few other equality rules. This succeeded for 112 problems. For one additional problem, `Prooftrans` failed.⁹ The length of the obtained proofs (number of steps, including axioms) was between 12 and 919 with median 55.

Equality-specific rules were then translated to binary resolution steps, which for no proof took longer than 0.04 s. The proof length (number of steps, including axioms) of the results was between 10 and 4,833, median 81 (in some cases the size decreased because non-clausal axioms were deleted).

These proofs were then converted to clausal tableaux in cut normal form that correspond to resolution trees. This failed for two of the 112 proofs due to memory exhaustion but succeeded for each of the others in less than 0.1 s, with exception of one problem, where it took 121 s. The median time per problem was 0.001 s. The proof size (number of inner nodes of the clausal tableau) in the results was between 20 and 97,866,317, median 259.

Finally the hyper conversion was applied with a timeout of 400 s per proof to the remaining 110 proofs. It succeeded for 107 proofs, within a median time of 0.01 s per proof, and a maximum time of 235 s. One failure was due to memory exhaustion, the other two were timeouts. The proof size (number of inner nodes of the clausal tableau) of the results was between 11 and 3,110, median 77. In 105 of the 107 cases the size was reduced. The largest proof on which the conversion succeeded had size 51,359 and was reduced to size 507. The ratios of the size of the hyper-converted tableau to the size of the source tableau were between 0.01 and 4.48, median 0.39.

Tables 1–3 show result data for each of the 112 problems. Figure 6 shows Prolog code to reproduce the experiments with PIE. The columns in these tables are as follows.

Problem The TPTP problem (TPTP v8.1.2).

Rtg Its latest rating in TPTP v8.1.2.

T1 Proving time in seconds, rounded (timeout 400 s).

S1 Number of steps of the original proof, after expansion into binary resolution and paramodulation by `Prooftrans`, including axioms.

S2 Number of steps of the binary resolution proof after translation of paramodulation and some other equality inferences to pure binary resolution, including axioms.

S3 Tree size (number of inner nodes) of the clausal tableau in cut normal form, where “–” indicates failure of the conversion.

S4 Tree size (number of inner nodes) of the clausal tableau after the hyper conversion, where “–” indicates a timeout (400 s) of the conversion.

T2 Time for the hyper conversion in seconds, rounded.

⁷ `Prover9`'s `auto2` mode used in the *CASC-J11* competition leads to some proofs with the `new_symbol` rule that so far can not be translated.

⁸ On a Linux notebook with 12th Gen Intel[®] Core™ i7-1260P CPU and 32 GB RAM.

⁹ LCL664+1.005, *Fatal error: set_vars_recurse: max_vars*.

Table 1. Conversion data for CASC-J11 problems (I/III).

Problem	Rtg	T1	S1	S2	S3	S4	T2
ALG019+1	0.25	0	28	52	129	36	0
ALG210+2	0.25	0	43	97	305	149	0
ALG219+1	0.28	1	115	209	305	120	0
COM008+2	0.53	5	60	84	857	104	0
CSR007+1	0.53	0	217	327	5,078	1,743	9
CSR008+1	0.50	0	247	377	8,912	2,023	21
CSR024+1.009	0.47	1	166	250	865	270	0
CSR024+1.010	0.47	0	179	259	801	265	0
GEO082+1	0.22	0	22	37	47	22	0
GEO083+1	0.42	6	24	43	57	27	0
GEO094+1	0.36	0	40	34	101	40	0
GEO112+1	0.31	0	21	54	49	21	0
GEO125+1	0.25	0	29	68	65	27	0
GEO126+1	0.42	0	66	132	388	372	0
GEO127+1	0.47	0	92	151	2,069	341	0
GEO499+1	0.39	1	12	28	33	17	0
GEO524+1	0.39	0	13	27	45	21	0
GEO526+1	0.56	8	30	60	73	29	0
GEO541+1	0.33	2	92	73	257	93	0
GEO555+1	0.39	3	79	65	601	77	0
GEO557+1	0.39	2	66	52	1,203	111	0
GRA007+2	0.50	399	101	145	1,545	331	0
GRP655+2	0.54	79	919	4,833	–	–	–
GRP711+1	0.21	0	53	116	1,001	269	0
GRP720+1	0.71	7	158	469	10,041	2,271	183
GRP746+1	0.58	70	795	2,443	97,866,317	–	–

Table 2. Conversion data for CASC-J11 problems (II/III).

Problem	Rtg	T1	S1	S2	S3	S4	T2
GRP747+1	0.25	12	28	59	636	2,850	8
GRP779+1	0.72	6	267	655	11,101	1,742	105
ITP015+1	0.44	0	70	250	805	339	1
ITP020+1	0.42	0	20	67	97	34	0
ITP023+1	0.36	0	38	105	261	94	0
KLE041+1	0.44	2	77	134	669	240	0
KLE170+1.002	0.39	0	62	125	2,409	220	0
KRS188+1	0.33	16	16	13	33	17	0
KRS191+1	0.33	0	13	10	21	11	0
KRS193+1	0.33	0	13	10	21	11	0
KRS194+1	0.33	0	13	10	21	11	0
KRS196+1	0.33	0	13	10	21	11	0
KRS202+1	0.27	0	45	38	94	48	0
KRS203+1	0.27	0	35	29	66	34	0
KRS216+1	0.40	17	21	15	30	17	0
KRS217+1	0.27	1	32	25	54	27	0
KRS234+1	0.33	0	19	15	37	16	0
KRS235+1	0.33	1	19	15	37	16	0
LCL456+1	0.25	0	25	20	45	22	0
LCL485+1	0.58	20	96	145	749	307	0
LCL509+1	0.56	11	99	154	8,609	1,926	61
LCL549+1	0.61	150	183	242	1,195	1,120	5
MGT034+2	0.22	0	101	143	1,306	116	0
MGT039+2	0.25	0	422	502	–	–	–
MGT042+1	0.22	0	89	137	667	268	0
MGT061+1	0.22	0	95	141	529	142	0
MGT065+1	0.28	0	111	165	3,071	556	1
MGT067+1	0.27	0	58	51	177	64	0
NUM317+1	0.64	92	27	24	49	25	0
NUM323+1	0.53	90	18	15	29	15	0
NUM329+1	0.33	1	15	12	20	12	0
NUM568+3	0.22	3	15	28	41	17	0
NUM613+3	0.25	6	58	86	189	81	0
NUM925+5	0.25	179	90	205	1,081	213	0
NUM926+2	0.47	0	18	50	29	15	0
NUM926+6	0.44	0	33	87	97	43	0
NUM926+7	0.47	4	28	80	77	37	0
NUN057+2	0.42	1	57	106	508	152	0
NUN060+1	0.27	0	18	14	33	17	0
NUN062+1	0.27	2	33	24	61	26	0
NUN066+2	0.22	0	111	194	3,061	3,110	55
NUN068+2	0.22	0	91	163	2,692	2,268	19
NUN072+2	0.44	3	92	188	961	276	0

Table 3. Conversion data for CASC-J11 problems (III/III).

Problem	Rtg	T1	S1	S2	S3	S4	T2
NUN076+1	0.27	0	30	24	61	31	0
NUN081+1	0.27	0	14	11	25	13	0
PRO002+3	0.47	3	145	294	4,291	329	0
PRO004+2	0.36	19	152	227	14,299	192	0
PRO009+1	0.28	3	194	287	4,655	491	1
PUZ001+2	0.31	0	43	100	173	62	0
PUZ078+1	0.25	1	200	238	51,359	507	4
PUZ133+1	0.44	0	112	177	1,505	468	1
REL025+1	0.50	3	295	740	85,513	–	–
REL050+1	0.29	1	158	373	30,213	2,219	235
RNG103+2	0.28	0	29	52	117	51	0
SET076+1	0.33	2	19	40	49	25	0
SET094+1	0.25	0	14	31	33	17	0
SET601+3	0.36	0	97	356	1,865	880	9
SET637+3	0.28	0	46	75	279	51	0
SET681+3	0.50	0	86	131	492	142	0
SET686+3	0.56	0	70	116	685	148	0
SEU187+2	0.36	9	86	179	729	179	0
SEU363+1	0.39	0	66	124	177	74	0
SWB013+2	0.28	44	57	74	129	52	0
SWC037+1	0.22	0	38	55	161	52	0
SWV161+1	0.33	2	25	58	77	30	0
SWV162+1	0.33	2	25	58	77	30	0
SWV167+1	0.25	3	29	54	109	36	0
SWV202+1	0.31	13	47	72	249	80	0
SWV203+1	0.31	13	47	72	249	80	0
SWV237+1	0.33	1	18	33	65	24	0
SWV401+1	0.31	1	47	81	289	114	0
SWV415+1	0.22	0	17	52	57	27	0
SWV417+1	0.25	0	17	49	37	13	0
SWV449+1	0.44	0	39	76	121	51	0
SWV451+1	0.44	16	77	165	1,122	176	0
SWV455+1	0.28	0	29	55	81	37	0
SWV457+1	0.42	0	91	164	1,829	132	0
SWV466+1	0.50	0	123	216	853	277	0
SWV470+1	0.67	0	77	143	497	74	0
SWV472+1	0.67	8	110	227	1,341	143	0
SWV477+1	0.42	25	104	177	3,393	307	0
SWV481+1	0.64	32	142	210	1,461	178	0
SWW229+1	0.31	2	18	72	73	21	0
SWW233+1	0.47	31	80	143	373	111	0
SWW473+1	0.25	14	16	81	57	19	0
SYN353+1	0.40	0	79	78	1,032	–	–

```

exp(Problem) :-
    getenv('PIE', PIE),
    format(atom(ScratchTPTP), '~w/scratch/scratch_tptp', [PIE]),
    consult(ScratchTPTP),
    get_time(T1),
    ppl_valid(tptp(Problem),
             [mace=false,
              proof=Proof,
              prooftrans_options='expand renumber',
              prooftrans_jterms,
              r=true,
              timeout=400]),
    get_time(T2),
    Proof = [proof(PSteps)],
    length(PSteps, L1),
    p9proof_install(Proof, [eq=binres_only]),
    current_p9proof(PureResolProof),
    length(PureResolProof, L2),
    get_time(T3),
    p9proof_to_ct(Proof, CT, [eq=binres_only]),
    get_time(T4),
    ct_tsize(CT, SCT),
    get_time(T5),
    ct_trafo_hyper(CT, CT1),
    get_time(T6),
    ct_tsize(CT1, SCT1),
    format('Problem: ~w~n', [Problem]),
    TP is T2-T1,
    format('Proving time: ~w~n', [TP]),
    format('Proof steps: ~w~n', [L1]),
    format('Pure binary resolution steps: ~w~n', [L2]),
    TC is T4-T3,
    format('Time for conversion to cut normal form tableau: ~w~n',
          [TC]),
    format('Tree size of cut normal form tableau: ~w~n', [SCT]),
    TH is T6-T5,
    format('Time for hyper conversion: ~w~n', [TH]),
    format('Tree size of hyper converted tableau: ~w~n', [SCT1]).

```

Fig. 6. Code to run the described experiments in SWI-Prolog with PIE. An example invocation would be `?- exp('ALG019-1')`.