

Synthesizing Strongly Equivalent Logic Programs: Beth Definability for Answer Set Programs via Craig Interpolation in First-Order Logic^{*}

Jan Heuer[✉] and Christoph Wernhard[✉]

University of Potsdam, Potsdam, Germany
jan.heuer,christoph.wernhard@uni-potsdam.de

Abstract. We show a projective Beth definability theorem for logic programs under the stable model semantics: For given programs P and Q and vocabulary V (set of predicates) the existence of a program R in V such that $P \cup R$ and $P \cup Q$ are strongly equivalent can be expressed as a first-order entailment. Moreover, our result is effective: A program R can be constructed from a Craig interpolant for this entailment, using a known first-order encoding for testing strong equivalence, which we apply in reverse to extract programs from formulas. As a further perspective, this allows transforming logic programs via transforming their first-order encodings. In a prototypical implementation, the Craig interpolation is performed by first-order provers based on clausal tableaux or resolution calculi. Our work shows how definability and interpolation, which underlie modern logic-based approaches to advanced tasks in knowledge representation, transfer to answer set programming.

1 Introduction

Answer set programming [3,35,50,57,60] is one of the major paradigms in knowledge representation. A problem is expressed declaratively as a logic program, a set of rules in the form of implications. An answer set solver returns representations of its *answer sets* or *stable models* [36,49]. That is, minimal Herbrand models, where models with facts not properly justified in a non-circular way are excluded. Modern answer set solvers such as *clingo* [34] are advanced tools that integrate SAT technology.

Two logic programs can be considered as *equivalent* if and only if they have the same answer sets. However, if two equivalent programs are each combined with some other program, the results are not necessarily equivalent. Thus, it is of much more practical relevance to consider instead a notion of equivalence that guarantees the same answer sets even in combination with other programs: Two logic programs P, Q are *strongly equivalent* [54] if they can be exchanged in the context of any other program R without affecting the answer sets of the overall

^{*} Funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – Project-ID 457292495.

program. That is, P and Q are strongly equivalent if and only if for all logic programs R it holds that $P \cup R$ and $Q \cup R$ have the same answer sets.

Although it has been known that strong equivalence of logic programs under the stable model semantics can be translated into equivalence of classical logical formulas, e.g. [55], developments in the languages of answer set programming make this an issue of ongoing research [18, 25, 38, 39, 42, 53]. The practical objective is to apply first-order provers to determine the equivalence of two logic programs.

We now consider the situation where only a single program is given and a strongly equivalent one is to be synthesized automatically. For the new program the set of allowed predicates, including to some degree the position within rules in which they are allowed, is restricted to a given vocabulary. Not just “absolute” strong equivalence is of interest, but also strong equivalence with respect to some background knowledge expressed as a logic program. Thus, for given programs P and Q , and vocabulary V we want to find programs R in V such that $P \cup R$ and $Q \cup R$ are strongly equivalent.

Our question has two aspects: characterizing the *existence* of a program R for given P, Q, V and, if one exists, the effective *construction* of such an R . As we will show, existence can be addressed by Beth definability [7, 21] on the basis of Craig interpolation [20] for first-order logic. The construction can then be performed by extracting an interpolant from a proof of the first-order characterization of existence. We realize this practically with the first-order provers CProver [74, 75] and Prover9 [58] and an interpolation technique for clausal tableaux [76, 77].

To achieve this, we start from a known representation of logic programs in classical first-order logic for the purpose of verifying strong equality. We supplement it with a formal characterization to determine whether an arbitrary given first-order formula represents a logic program, and, if so, to extract a represented logic program from the formula. This novel “reverse translation” also has other potential applications in program transformation.

Beth definability and Craig interpolation play a key role for advanced tasks in other fields of knowledge representation, in particular for query reformulation in databases [5, 6, 59, 66, 72] and description logics as well as ontology-mediated querying [2, 16, 17, 73]. Our work aims to provide for these lines of research the bridge to answer set programming.

Structure of the Paper. After providing in Sect. 2 background material on strong equivalence as well as on interpolation and definability we develop in Sect. 3 our technical results. Our prototypical implementation¹ is then described in Sect. 4. We conclude in Sect. 5 with discussing related work and perspectives.

¹ Available from <http://cs.christophwernhard.com/pie/asp> as free software.

2 Background

2.1 Notation

We map between two formalisms: logic programs and formulas of classical first-order logic without equality (briefly *formulas*). In both formalisms we have *atoms* $p(t_1, \dots, t_n)$, where p is a *predicate* and t_1, \dots, t_n are terms built from *functions*, including *constants*, and *variables*. We assume variable names as case insensitive to take account of the custom to write them uppercase in logic programs and lowercase in first-order logic. Predicates in logic programs are distinct from those in formulas, but with a correspondence: If p is a predicate for use in logic programs, then the two predicates p^0 and p^1 , both with the same arity as p , are for use in formulas. Thus, predicates in formulas are always decorated with a 0 or 1 superscript. To emphasize this, we sometimes speak of *0/1-superscripted formulas*.

A *literal* is an atom or a negated atom. A *clause* is a disjunction of literals, a *clausal formula* is a conjunction of clauses. The empty disjunction is represented by \perp , the empty conjunction by \top . On occasion we write a clause also as an implication.

A subformula occurrence in a formula has *positive (negative) polarity* if it is in the scope of an even (odd) number of possibly implicit negations. A formula is *universal* if occurrences of \forall have only positive polarity and occurrences of \exists have only negative polarity. Semantic entailment and equivalence of formulas are expressed by \models and \equiv .

Let F be a formula. $\mathcal{F}un(F)$ is the set of functions occurring in it, including constants, and $\mathcal{P}red(F)$ is the set of predicates occurring in it. $\mathcal{P}red^\pm(F)$ is the set of pairs $\langle pol, p \rangle$, where p is a predicate and $pol \in \{+, -\}$, such that an atom with predicate p occurs in F with the polarity indicated by pol . We write $\langle +, p \rangle$ and $\langle -, p \rangle$ succinctly as $+p$ and $-p$. To map from the predicates occurring in a formula to predicates of logic programs we define $\mathcal{P}red^{LP}(F) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{p \mid p^i \in \mathcal{P}red(F), i \in \{0, 1\}\}$. For logic programs P , we define $\mathcal{F}un(P)$ and $\mathcal{P}red(P)$ analogously as for formulas.

2.2 Strong Equivalence as First-Order Equivalence

We consider *disjunctive logic programs with negation in the head* [48, Sect. 5], which provide a normal form for answer set programs [12]. A *logic program* is a set of *rules* of the form

$$A_1; \dots; A_k; \text{not } A_{k+1}; \dots; \text{not } A_l \leftarrow A_{l+1}, \dots, A_m, \text{not } A_{m+1}, \dots, \text{not } A_n,$$

where A_1, \dots, A_n are atoms, $0 \leq k \leq l \leq m \leq n$. Recall from Sect. 2.1 that an atom can have argument terms with functions and variables. The *positive/negative head* of a rule are the atoms A_1, \dots, A_k and A_{k+1}, \dots, A_l respectively. Analogously the *positive/negative body* of a rule are A_{l+1}, \dots, A_m and A_{m+1}, \dots, A_n respectively. Answer sets with respect to the stable model semantics for this class of programs are for example defined in [32].

Next we review the definition of the translation γ used to express strong equivalence of two logic programs in classical first-order logic.² It makes use of the fact that strong equivalence can be expressed in the intermediate logic of here-and-there [54], which in turn can be mapped to classical logic [62]. For details and proofs we refer to [25,38,39]. Similar results appeared in [28,55,62,63]. As stated in Sect. 2.1 we assume for each program predicate p two dedicated formula predicates p^0 and p^1 with the same arity. If A is an atom with predicate p , then A^0 is A with p^0 instead of p , and A^1 is A with p^1 instead of p .

Definition 1. For a rule

$$R = A_1; \dots; A_k; \text{not } A_{k+1}; \dots; \text{not } A_l \leftarrow A_{l+1}, \dots, A_m, \text{not } A_{m+1}, \dots, \text{not } A_n.$$

with variables \mathbf{x} define the first-order formulas $\gamma^0(R)$ and $\gamma^1(R)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma^0(R) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \forall \mathbf{x} (\bigwedge_{i=l+1}^m A_i^0 \wedge \bigwedge_{i=m+1}^n \neg A_i^1 \rightarrow \bigvee_{i=1}^k A_i^0 \vee \bigvee_{i=k+1}^l \neg A_i^1), \\ \gamma^1(R) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \forall \mathbf{x} (\bigwedge_{i=l+1}^m A_i^1 \wedge \bigwedge_{i=m+1}^n \neg A_i^1 \rightarrow \bigvee_{i=1}^k A_i^1 \vee \bigvee_{i=k+1}^l \neg A_i^1). \end{aligned}$$

For a logic program P define the first-order formula $\gamma(P)$ as

$$\gamma(P) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigwedge_{R \in P} \gamma^0(R) \wedge \bigwedge_{R \in P} \gamma^1(R).$$

and define the first-order formula S_P as

$$S_P \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigwedge_{p \in \text{Pred}(P)} \forall \mathbf{x} (p^0(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow p^1(\mathbf{x})),$$

where variables \mathbf{x} match the arity of p .

Using the transformation γ and the formula S_P we can express strong equivalence as an equivalence in first-order logic.

Proposition 2 ([38]). *Under the stable model semantics two logic programs P and Q are strongly equivalent iff the following equivalence holds in classical first-order logic $S_{P \cup Q} \wedge \gamma(P) \equiv S_{P \cup Q} \wedge \gamma(Q)$.*

2.3 Definition Synthesis with Craig Interpolation

A formula $Q(\mathbf{x})$ is *implicitly definable* in terms of a vocabulary (set of predicate and function symbols) V within a sentence F if, whenever two models of F agree on values of symbols in V , then they agree on the extension of Q , i.e., on the tuples of domain members that satisfy Q . In the special case where Q has no free variables, this means that they agree on the truth value of Q . Implicit definability can be expressed as

$$F \wedge F' \models \forall \mathbf{x} (Q(\mathbf{x}) \leftrightarrow Q'(\mathbf{x})), \quad (\text{i})$$

² With the notation γ we follow [25]. In [38,39] σ^* is used for the same translation.

where F' and Q' are copies of F and Q with all symbols not in V replaced by fresh symbols. This semantic notion contrasts with the syntactic one of *explicit definability*: A formula $Q(\mathbf{x})$ is *explicitly definable* in terms of a vocabulary V within a sentence F if there exists a formula $R(\mathbf{x})$ in the vocabulary V such that

$$F \models \forall \mathbf{x} (R(\mathbf{x}) \leftrightarrow Q(\mathbf{x})). \quad (\text{ii})$$

The “Beth property” [7] states equivalence of both notions and applies to first-order logic. “Craig interpolation” is a tool that can be applied to prove the “Beth property” [21], and, moreover to construct formulas R from given F, Q, V from a proof of implicit definability. Craig’s interpolation theorem [20] applies to first-order logic and states that if a formula F entails a formula G (or, equivalently, that $F \rightarrow G$ is valid), then there exists a formula H , a *Craig interpolant* of F and G , with the properties that $F \models H$, $H \models G$, and the vocabulary of H (predicate and function symbols as well as free variables) is in the common vocabulary of F and G . Craig’s theorem can be strengthened to the existence of *Craig-Lyndon interpolants* [56] that satisfy the additional property that predicates in H occur only in polarities in which they occur in both F and G . In our technical framework this condition is expressed as $\text{Pred}^\pm(H) \subseteq \text{Pred}^\pm(F) \cap \text{Pred}^\pm(G)$.

Craig’s interpolation theorem can be proven by constructing H from a proof of $F \models G$. This works on the basis of sequent calculi [68, 71] and analytic tableaux [29]. For calculi from automated first-order reasoning various approaches have been considered [10, 40, 44, 67, 76, 77]. A method [76] for clausal tableaux [46] performs Craig-Lyndon interpolation and operates on proofs emitted by a general first-order prover, without need to modify the prover for interpolation, and inheriting completeness for full first-order logic from it. Indirectly that method also works on resolution proofs expanded into trees [77].

Observe that the characterization of implicit definability (i) can also be expressed as $F \wedge Q(\mathbf{x}) \models F' \rightarrow Q'(\mathbf{x})$. An “explicit” definiens $R(\mathbf{x})$ can now be constructed from given $F, Q(\mathbf{x})$ and V just as a Craig interpolant of $F \wedge Q(\mathbf{x})$ and $F' \rightarrow Q'(\mathbf{x})$. The synthesis of definitions by Craig interpolation was recognized as a logic-based core technique for view-based query reformulation in relational databases [5, 59, 66, 72]. Often strengthened variations of Craig-Lyndon interpolation are used there that preserve criteria for domain independence, e.g., through relativized quantifiers [5] or range-restriction [77].

3 Variations of Craig Interpolation and Beth Definability for Logic Programs

We synthesize logic programs according to a variation of Beth’s theorem justified by a variation of Craig-Lyndon interpolation. Craig-Lyndon interpolation “out of the box” is not sufficient for our purposes: To obtain logic programs as definienda we need as a basis a stronger form of interpolation where the interpolant is not just a first-order formula but, moreover, is the first-order encoding of a logic program, permitting to actually extract the program.

3.1 Extracting Logic Programs from a First-Order Encoding

We address the questions of how to abstractly characterize first-order formulas that encode a logic program, and how to extract the program from a first-order formula that meets the characterization. As specified in Sect. 2.1, we assume first-order formulas over predicates superscripted with 0 and 1. The notation S_P (Definition 1) is now overloaded for 0/1-superscripted formulas F as $S_F \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigwedge_{p \in \text{Pred}^{LP}(F)} \forall \mathbf{x} (p^0(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow p^1(\mathbf{x}))$, where variables \mathbf{x} match the arity of p . We introduce a convenient notation for the result of systematically renaming all 0-superscripted predicates to their 1-superscripted correspondence.

Definition 3. For 0/1-superscripted first-order formulas F define $\text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(F)$ as F with all occurrences of 0-superscripted predicates p^0 replaced by the corresponding 1-superscripted predicate p^1 .

Obviously $\text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}$ can be moved over logic operators, e.g., $\text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(F \wedge G) \equiv \text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(F) \wedge \text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(G)$, and $\text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(\forall \mathbf{x} F) \equiv \forall \mathbf{x} \text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(F)$. Semantically, $\text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}$ preserves entailment and thus also equivalence.

Proposition 4. For 0/1-superscripted first-order formulas F and G it holds that (i) If $F \models G$, then $\text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(F) \models \text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(G)$. (ii) If $F \equiv G$, then $\text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(F) \equiv \text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(G)$.

Observe that for all rules R it holds that $\gamma^1(R) = \text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(\gamma^0(R))$ and for all logic programs P it holds that $\gamma(P) \models \text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(\gamma(P))$. On the basis of $\text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}$ we define a first-order criterion for a formula encoding a logic program, that is, a first-order entailment that holds if and only if a given first-order formula encodes a logic program.

Definition 5. A 0/1-superscripted first-order formula F is said to *encode a logic program* iff F is universal and $S_F \wedge F \models \text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(F)$.

This criterion adequately characterizes that the formula represents a logic program on the basis of the translation γ . The following theorem justifies this.

Theorem 6 (Formulas Encoding a Logic Program). (i) For all logic programs P it holds that $\gamma(P)$ is a 0/1-superscripted first-order formula that encodes a logic program. (ii) If a 0/1-superscripted first-order formula F encodes a logic program, then there exists a logic program P such that $S_F \models \gamma(P) \leftrightarrow F$, $\text{Pred}(P) \subseteq \text{Pred}^{LP}(F)$ and $\text{Fun}(P) \subseteq \text{Fun}(F)$. Moreover, such a program P can be effectively constructed from F .

Proof. (6.i) Immediate from the definition of γ . (6.ii) Procedure 7 specified below and proven correct in Prop. 8 shows the construction of a suitable program. \square

Theorem 6.ii claims that the vocabulary of the program is only *included* in the respective vocabulary of the formula. This gives for the formula the freedom of a larger vocabulary with symbols that may be eliminated, e.g., by simplifications.

Procedure 7 (Decoding an Encoding of a Logic Program).

INPUT: A 0/1-superscripted first-order formula F that encodes a logic program.

METHOD:

1. Bring F into conjunctive normal form matching $\forall \mathbf{x} (M_0 \wedge M_1)$, where M_0 and M_1 are clausal formulas such that in all clauses of M_0 there is a literal whose predicate has superscript 0 and in all clauses of M_1 the predicates of all literals have superscript 1.
2. Partition M_1 into two clausal formulas M_1' and M_1'' such that

$$\forall \mathbf{x} \text{ rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(M_0) \models \forall \mathbf{x} M_1''.$$

A possibility is to take $M_1' = M_1$ and $M_1'' = \top$. Another possibility that often leads to a smaller M' is to consider each clause C in M_1 and place it into M_1' or M_1'' depending on whether there is a clause D in M_0 such that $\text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(D)$ subsumes C .

3. Let P be the set of rules

$$A_1; \dots; A_k; \text{ not } A_{k+1}; \dots; \text{ not } A_l \leftarrow A_{l+1}, \dots, A_m, \text{ not } A_{m+1}, \dots, \text{ not } A_n$$

for each clause $\bigwedge_{i=l+1}^m A_i^0 \wedge \bigwedge_{i=m+1}^n \neg A_i^1 \rightarrow \bigvee_{i=0}^k A_i^0 \vee \bigvee_{i=k+1}^l \neg A_i^1$ in $M_0 \wedge M_1'$.

OUTPUT: Return P , a logic program such that $\mathcal{S}_P \models \gamma(P) \leftrightarrow F$, $\text{Pred}(P) \subseteq \text{Pred}^{LP}(F)$ and $\text{Fun}(P) \subseteq \text{Fun}(F)$.

Proposition 8. *Procedure 7 is correct.*

Proof. For an input formula F and output program P the syntactic requirements $\text{Pred}(P) \subseteq \text{Pred}^{LP}(F)$ and $\text{Fun}(P) \subseteq \text{Fun}(F)$ are easy to see from the construction of P by the procedure. To prove the semantic requirement $\mathcal{S}_P \models \gamma(P) \leftrightarrow F$ we first note the following assumptions, which follow straightforwardly from the specification of the procedure.

- (1) $\mathcal{S}_F \wedge F \models \text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(F)$.
- (2) $F \equiv \forall \mathbf{x} (M_0 \wedge M_1' \wedge M_1'')$.
- (3) $\text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(\forall \mathbf{x} M_0) \models \forall \mathbf{x} M_1''$.
- (4) $\gamma(P) \equiv \forall \mathbf{x} (M_0 \wedge \text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(M_0) \wedge M_1')$.

The semantic requirement $\mathcal{S}_F \models \gamma(P) \leftrightarrow F$ can then be derived as follows.

- | | |
|---|-----------------|
| (5) $\mathcal{S}_F \wedge F \models \text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(\forall \mathbf{x} M_0)$. | By (2) and (1). |
| (6) $\mathcal{S}_F \wedge F \models \forall \mathbf{x} (M_0 \wedge \text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(M_0) \wedge M_1')$. | By (5) and (2). |
| (7) $\mathcal{S}_F \wedge F \models \gamma(P)$. | By (6) and (4). |
| (8) $\gamma(P) \models \forall \mathbf{x} (M_0 \wedge M_1'' \wedge M_1')$. | By (4) and (3). |
| (9) $\gamma(P) \models F$. | By (8) and (2). |
| (10) $\mathcal{S}_F \models \gamma(P) \leftrightarrow F$. | By (9) and (7). |

□

Some examples illustrate Procedure 7 and the *encoding a logic program* property.

Example 9.

(i) Consider the following clauses and programs.

$$\begin{array}{lll}
C_1 = \neg p^0 \vee q^1 \vee r^0 & P = r \leftarrow p, \mathbf{not} \ q. & P' = r \leftarrow p, \mathbf{not} \ q. \\
C_2 = \neg s^1 \vee t^1 \vee u^1 & \mathbf{not} \ s \leftarrow \mathbf{not} \ t, \mathbf{not} \ u. & \mathbf{not} \ s \leftarrow \mathbf{not} \ t, \mathbf{not} \ u. \\
C_3 = \neg p^1 \vee q^1 \vee r^1 & \mathbf{not} \ p \leftarrow \mathbf{not} \ q, \mathbf{not} \ r. &
\end{array}$$

Assume as input of Procedure 7 the formula $F = C_1 \wedge C_2 \wedge C_3$. Then $M_0 = C_1$ and $M_1 = C_2 \wedge C_3$. If in step 2 we set $M'_1 = M_1$ and $M''_1 = \top$, then the extracted program is P . We might, however, also set $M'_1 = C_2$ and $M''_1 = C_3$ and obtain the shorter strongly equivalent program P' .

(ii) For $F = \neg p^1 \vee q^1 \vee r^0$ we have to set $M'_1 = M''_1 = M_1 = \top$ and the procedure yields $\{r; \mathbf{not} \ p \leftarrow \mathbf{not} \ q.\}$.(iii) The formula $F = \neg p^0 \vee q^1 \vee r^0$ does not encode a logic program because $S_F \wedge F \not\models \mathbf{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(F)$.

Remark 1. For the extracted program it is desirable that it is not unnecessarily large. Specifically it should not contain rules that are easily identified as redundant. Step 2 of Procedure 7 permits techniques to keep M' small. Other possibilities include well-known formula simplification techniques that preserve equivalence such as removal of tautological or subsumed clauses and may be integrated into clausification, step 1 of the procedure. In addition, conversions that just preserve equivalence modulo S_F may be applied, conceptually as a preprocessing step, although in practice possibly implemented on the clausal form. Procedure 7 then receives as input not F but a universal first-order formula F' whose vocabulary is included in that of F with the property

$$S_F \models F' \leftrightarrow F. \quad (\text{iii})$$

Formula F' then also encodes a program: That $S_{F'} \wedge F' \models \mathbf{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(F')$ follows from $S_F \wedge F \models \mathbf{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(F)$, (iii) and Prop. 4.ii. Procedure 7 guarantees for its output $S_{F'} \models \gamma(P) \leftrightarrow F'$, hence by (iii) it follows that $S_F \models \gamma(P) \leftrightarrow F$.

Example 10. Consider the following clauses and programs.

$$\begin{array}{lll}
C_1 = \neg p^0 \vee q^1 \vee r^0 & P = r \leftarrow p, \mathbf{not} \ q. & P' = r \leftarrow p, \mathbf{not} \ q. \\
C_2 = \neg p^0 \vee q^1 \vee r^1 & \leftarrow p, \mathbf{not} \ q, \mathbf{not} \ r. & \\
C_3 = \neg p^1 \vee q^1 \vee r^1 & &
\end{array}$$

Assume as input of Procedure 7 the formula $F = C_1 \wedge C_2 \wedge C_3$. Then $M_0 = C_1 \wedge C_2$ and $M_1 = C_3$, and, aiming at a short program, we can set $M'_1 = \top$ and $M''_1 = C_3$. The extracted program is then P . By preprocessing F according to Remark 1 we can eliminate C_2 from F and obtain the shorter strongly equivalent program P' .

3.2 A Refinement of Craig Interpolation for Logic Programs

With the material from Sect. 3.1 on extracting logic programs from formulas we can now state a theorem on *LP-interpolation*, where *LP* stands for *logic program*. It is a variation of Craig interpolation applying to first-order formulas that encode logic programs. The theorem states not only the existence of an LP-interpolant, but, moreover, also claims effective construction.

Theorem 11 (LP-Interpolation). *Let F be a 0/1-superscripted first-order formula that encodes a logic program and let G be a 0/1-superscripted first-order formula such that $\mathcal{F}un(F) \subseteq \mathcal{F}un(G)$ and $\mathcal{S}_F \wedge F \models \mathcal{S}_G \rightarrow G$. Then there exists a 0/1-superscripted first-order formula H , called the LP-interpolant of F and G , such that*

1. $\mathcal{S}_F \wedge F \models H$.
2. $H \models \mathcal{S}_G \rightarrow G$.
3. $\mathcal{P}red^\pm(H) \subseteq S \cup \{+p^1 \mid +p^0 \in S\} \cup \{-p^1 \mid -p^0 \in S\}$, where $S = \mathcal{P}red^\pm(\mathcal{S}_F \wedge F) \cap \mathcal{P}red^\pm(\mathcal{S}_G \rightarrow G)$.
4. $\mathcal{F}un(H) \subseteq \mathcal{F}un(F)$.
5. H encodes a logic program.

Moreover, if existence holds, then an LP-interpolant H can be effectively constructed, via a universal Craig-Lyndon interpolant of $F \wedge \mathcal{S}_F$ and $\mathcal{S}_G \rightarrow G$.

Proof. We show the construction of a suitable formula H . Let H' be a Craig-Lyndon interpolant of $\mathcal{S}_F \wedge F$ and $\mathcal{S}_G \rightarrow G$. Since F and \mathcal{S}_F are universal first-order formulas and we have the precondition $\mathcal{F}un(F) \subseteq \mathcal{F}un(G)$, we may in addition assume that H' is a universal first-order formula. (This additional condition is guaranteed for example by the interpolation method from [76], which computes H' directly from a clausal tableaux proof, or indirectly from a resolution proof [77].) Define $H \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} H' \wedge \text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(H')$. Claims 2, 4 and 5 of the theorem statement are then easy to see. Claim 1 can be shown as follows. We may assume the following.

- | | |
|---|---|
| (1) $\mathcal{S}_F \wedge F \models H'$. | Since H' is a Craig-Lyndon interpolant. |
| (2) $\mathcal{S}_F \wedge F \models \text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(F)$. | Since F encodes a logic program. |

Claim 1 can then be derived in the following steps.

- | | |
|---|--|
| (3) $\text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(\mathcal{S}_F \wedge F) \models \text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(H')$. | By (1) and Prop. 4.i. |
| (4) $\mathcal{S}_F \wedge F \models \text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(\mathcal{S}_F \wedge F)$. | By (2), since $\text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(\mathcal{S}_F) \equiv \top$. |
| (5) $\mathcal{S}_F \wedge F \models \text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(H')$. | By (4) and (3). |
| (6) $\mathcal{S}_F \wedge F \models H$. | By (5) and (1), since $H = H' \wedge \text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(H')$. |

Claim 3 follows because since H' is a Craig-Lyndon interpolant it holds that $\mathcal{P}red^\pm(H') \subseteq \mathcal{P}red^\pm(\mathcal{S}_F \wedge F) \cap \mathcal{P}red^\pm(\mathcal{S}_G \rightarrow G)$. With the predicate occurrences in $\text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(H')$, i.e., 1-superscripted predicates in positions of 0-superscripted predicates in H' , we obtain the restriction of $\mathcal{P}red^\pm(H)$ stated as claim 3. \square

For an LP-interpolant of formulas F and G , where F encodes a logic program, the semantic properties stated in claims 1 and 2 are those of a Craig or Craig-Lyndon interpolant of $\mathcal{S}_F \wedge F$ and $\mathcal{S}_G \rightarrow G$. The allowed polarity/predicate pairs are those common in $\mathcal{S}_F \wedge F$ and $\mathcal{S}_G \rightarrow G$, as in a Craig-Lyndon interpolant, and, in addition, the 1-superscripted versions of polarity/predicate pairs that appear only 0-superscripted among these common pairs. These additional pairs are those that might occur in the result of $\text{rename}_{0 \rightarrow 1}$ applied to a Craig-Lyndon interpolant. In contrast to a Craig interpolant, functions are only constrained

by the first given formula F . Permitting only functions common to F and G can result in an interpolant with existential quantification, which thus does not encode a program. Claim 5 states that the LP-interpolant indeed encodes a logic program as characterized in Definition 5. This property is, so-to-speak, passed through from the given formula F to the LP-interpolant.

3.3 Effective Projective Definability of Logic Programs

We present a variation of the “Beth property” that applies to logic programs with stable model semantics and takes strong equivalence into account. The underlying technique is our LP-interpolation, Theorem 11. It maps into Craig-Lyndon interpolation for first-order logic, utilizing that strong equivalence of logic programs can be expressed as first-order equivalence of encoded programs. This approach allows the effective construction of logic programs in the role of “explicit definitions” via Craig-Lyndon interpolation on first-order formulas. Our variation of the “Beth property” is *projective* as it is with respect to a given set of predicates allowed in the definiens. While our LP-interpolation theorem was expressed in terms of first-order formulas that encode logic programs, we now phrase definability entirely in terms of logic programs.³

Theorem 12 (Effective Projective Definability of Logic Programs).

Let P and Q be logic programs and let $V \subseteq \text{Pred}(P) \cup \text{Pred}(Q)$ be a set of predicates. The existence of a logic program R with $\text{Pred}(R) \subseteq V$, $\text{Fun}(R) \subseteq \text{Fun}(P) \cup \text{Fun}(Q)$ such that $P \cup R$ and $P \cup Q$ are strongly equivalent is expressible as entailment between two first-order formulas. Moreover, if existence holds, such a program R can be effectively constructed, via a universal Craig-Lyndon interpolant of the left and the right side of the entailment.

Proof. The first-order entailment that characterizes the existence of a logic program R is $\mathsf{S}_P \wedge \mathsf{S}_Q \wedge \gamma(P) \wedge \gamma(Q) \models \neg \mathsf{S}_{P'} \vee \neg \mathsf{S}_{Q'} \vee \neg \gamma(P') \vee \gamma(Q')$, where the primed programs P' and Q' are like P and Q , except that predicates not in V are replaced by fresh predicates. If the entailment holds, we can construct a program R as follows: Let H be the LP-interpolant of $\gamma(P) \wedge \gamma(Q)$ and $\neg \gamma(P') \vee \gamma(Q')$, as specified in Theorem 11, and extract the program R from H with Procedure 7. That R constructed in this way has the properties claimed in the theorem statement can be shown as follows. Since H is an LP-interpolant it follows that

- (1) $\mathsf{S}_P \wedge \mathsf{S}_Q \wedge \gamma(P) \wedge \gamma(Q) \models H$.
- (2) $H \models \neg \mathsf{S}_{P'} \vee \neg \mathsf{S}_{Q'} \vee \neg \gamma(P') \vee \gamma(Q')$.
- (3) $\text{Pred}^{LP}(H) \subseteq V$.
- (4) $\text{Fun}(H) \subseteq \text{Fun}(P) \cup \text{Fun}(Q)$.
- (5) H encodes a logic program.

From the preconditions of the theorem and since R is extracted from H with Procedure 7 and thus meets the properties stated in Theorem 6.ii it follows that

³ LP-interpolation could also be phrased in terms of logic programs, providing an interpolation result for logic programs on its own, not just as basis for definability. We plan to address this in future work.

- (6) $V \subseteq \text{Pred}(P) \cup \text{Pred}(Q)$.
- (7) $S_H \models \gamma(R) \leftrightarrow H$.
- (8) $\text{Pred}(R) \subseteq \text{Pred}^{LP}(H)$.
- (9) $\text{Fun}(R) \subseteq \text{Fun}(H)$.

The claimed properties of the theorem statement can then be derived as steps (10), (11) and (18) as follows.

- (10) $\text{Pred}(R) \subseteq V$. By (8) and (3).
- (11) $\text{Fun}(R) \subseteq \text{Fun}(P) \cup \text{Fun}(Q)$. By (9) and (4).
- (12) $S_P \wedge S_Q \models S_H$. By (6) and (3).
- (13) $S_P \wedge S_Q \wedge \gamma(P) \wedge \gamma(Q) \models \gamma(R)$. By (12), (7) and (1).
- (14) $S_{P'} \wedge S_{Q'} \wedge \gamma(P') \wedge \neg\gamma(Q') \models \neg H$. By (2).
- (15) $S_P \wedge S_Q \wedge \gamma(P) \wedge \neg\gamma(Q) \models \neg H$. By (14), (3) and (4).
- (16) $S_P \wedge S_Q \wedge \gamma(P) \wedge \neg\gamma(Q) \models \neg\gamma(R)$. By (15), (12) and (7).
- (17) $S_P \wedge S_Q \wedge \gamma(P) \wedge \gamma(R) \equiv S_P \wedge S_Q \wedge \gamma(P) \wedge \gamma(Q)$. By (16) and (13).
- (18) $P \cup R$ and $P \cup Q$ are strongly equivalent. By (17) and Prop. 2.

Conversely, we have to show that if there exists a logic program R with the properties in the above theorem statement, then the characterizing entailment $S_P \wedge S_Q \wedge \gamma(P) \wedge \gamma(Q) \models \neg S_{P'} \vee \neg S_{Q'} \vee \neg\gamma(P') \vee \gamma(Q')$ does hold. We may assume

- (19) $\text{Pred}(R) \subseteq V \subseteq \text{Pred}(P) \cup \text{Pred}(Q)$.
- (20) $\text{Fun}(R) \subseteq \text{Fun}(P) \cup \text{Fun}(Q)$.
- (21) $P \cup R$ and $P \cup Q$ are strongly equivalent.

The characterizing entailment can then be derived as follows.

- (22) $S_P \wedge S_Q \models S_R$ By (19).
- (23) $S_P \wedge S_Q \wedge \gamma(P) \wedge \gamma(R) \equiv S_P \wedge S_Q \wedge \gamma(P) \wedge \gamma(Q)$. By (21), Prop. 2 and (22).
- (24) $S_P \wedge S_Q \wedge \gamma(P) \wedge \gamma(Q) \models \gamma(R)$. By (23).
- (25) $S_P \wedge S_Q \wedge \gamma(P) \wedge \neg\gamma(Q) \models \neg\gamma(R)$. By (23).
- (26) $S_{P'} \wedge S_{Q'} \wedge \gamma(P') \wedge \neg\gamma(Q') \models \neg\gamma(R)$. By (25), (19) and (20).
- (27) $S_P \wedge S_Q \wedge \gamma(P) \wedge \gamma(Q) \models \neg S_{P'} \vee \neg S_{Q'} \vee \neg\gamma(P') \vee \gamma(Q')$. By (26) and (24).

□

We now give some examples from the application point of view.

Example 13. The following examples show for given programs P, Q and sets V of predicates a possible value of R according to Theorem 12.

- (i) $Q = p \leftarrow q, r.$ $V = \{p, r\}$ $R = p \leftarrow r.$
 $p; q \leftarrow r.$
 $q \leftarrow q, s.$

In this first example we consider the special case where P is empty and thus not shown. Predicates q and s are redundant in Q , “absolutely” and not just relative to a program P . By Theorem 12, this is proven with the characterizing first-order entailment and, moreover, a strongly equivalent reformulation of Q without q and s is obtained as R .

- (ii) $P = p(X) \leftarrow q(X).$ $Q = r(X) \leftarrow p(X).$ $V = \{p, r\}$ $R = r(X) \leftarrow p(X).$
 $r(X) \leftarrow q(X).$

Only r and p are allowed in R . Or, equivalently, q is redundant in Q , *relative* to program P . Again, this is proven with the characterizing first-order entailment and, moreover, a strongly equivalent reformulation of Q without q is obtained as R . It is the clause in Q with q that is redundant relative to P and hence is eliminated in R .

$$(iii) \quad P = \leftarrow p(X), q(X). \quad Q = r(X) \leftarrow p(X), \mathbf{not} \ q(X). \quad V = \{p, r\}$$

$$R = r(X) \leftarrow p(X).$$

Only r and p are allowed in R . The negated literal with q in the body of the rule in Q is redundant relative to P and is eliminated in R .

$$(iv) \quad P = p(X) \leftarrow q(X), \mathbf{not} \ r(X). \quad Q = t(X) \leftarrow p(X). \quad V = \{q, r, s, t\}$$

$$p(X) \leftarrow s(X). \quad R = t(X) \leftarrow q(X), \mathbf{not} \ r(X).$$

$$\mathbf{not} \ r(X); s(X) \leftarrow p(X). \quad t(X) \leftarrow s(X).$$

$$q(X); s(X) \leftarrow p(X).$$

The predicate p is not allowed in R . The idea is that p is a predicate that can be used by a client but is not in the actual knowledge base. Program P expresses a schema mapping from the client predicate p to the knowledge base predicates q, r, s . The result program R is a rewriting of the client query Q in terms of knowledge base predicates. Only the first two rules of P actually describe the mapping. The other two rules complete them to a full definition, similar to Clark's completion [19], but here yielding also a program. Such completed predicate specifications seem necessary for the envisaged reformulation tasks.

$$(v) \quad P = \text{As in Example 13.iv.} \quad Q = t(X) \leftarrow q(X), \mathbf{not} \ r(X). \quad V = \{p, t\}$$

$$t(X) \leftarrow s(X).$$

$$R = t(X) \leftarrow p(X).$$

In this example P is from Example 13.iv, while Q and R are also from that example but switched. The vocabulary allows only p and t . While Example 13.iv realizes an unfolding of p , this example realizes folding into p .

$$(vi) \quad P = n(X) \leftarrow z(X). \quad Q = \mathbf{not} \ n(X_2) \leftarrow z(X_0), s(X_0, X_1),$$

$$n(X) \leftarrow n(Y), s(Y, X). \quad s(X_1, X_2).$$

$$V = \{z, s\} \quad R = \leftarrow z(X_0), s(X_0, X_1), s(X_1, X_2).$$

Program P defines natural numbers recursively. Program Q has a rule whose body specifies the natural number 2 and whose head denies that 2 is a natural number. Because P implies that 2 is a natural number, this head is in R rewritten to the empty head, enforced by disallowing the predicate for natural numbers in R .

$$(vii) \quad P = c(X, Y, Z) \leftarrow r(X, Y), r(Y, Z). \quad Q = r(X, Y); \mathbf{not} \ r(X, Y).$$

$$\leftarrow c(X, Y, Z), \mathbf{not} \ r(X, Y). \quad \leftarrow c(X, Y, Z), \mathbf{not} \ r(X, Z).$$

$$\leftarrow c(X, Y, Z), \mathbf{not} \ r(Y, Z). \quad R = r(X, Y); \mathbf{not} \ r(X, Y).$$

$$V = \{r\} \quad \leftarrow r(X, Y), r(Y, Z), \mathbf{not} \ r(X, Z).$$

Program Q describes a transitive relation r using the helper predicate c to identify chains where transitivity needs to be checked. In R the use of c is not allowed, program P gives the definition of c . Similar to Example 13.iv this realizes an unfolding of c .

Definability according to Theorem 12 inherits potential *decidability* from the first-order entailment problem that characterizes it. If, e.g., in the involved programs only constants occur as function symbols, the characterizing entailment can be expressed as validity in the decidable Bernays-Schönfinkel class.

3.4 Constraining Positions of Predicates within Rules

The sensitivity of LP-interpolation to polarity inherited from Craig-Lyndon interpolation and the program encoding with superscripted predicates offers a more fine-grained control of the vocabulary of definitions than Theorem 12 by considering also positions of predicates in rules. The following corollary shows this.

Corollary 14 (Position-Constrained Effective Projective Definability of Logic Programs). *Let P and Q be logic programs and let $V_+, V_{+1}, V_- \subseteq \text{Pred}(P) \cup \text{Pred}(Q)$ be three sets of predicates. Call a logic program R in scope of $\langle V_+, V_{+1}, V_- \rangle$ if predicates p occur in R only as specified in the following table.*

<i>p is allowed in</i>	<i>only if p is in</i>
Positive heads	V_+
Negative bodies	$V_+ \cup V_{+1}$
Negative heads	V_-
Positive bodies	V_-

The existence of a logic program R in scope of $\langle V_+, V_{+1}, V_- \rangle$ with $\text{Fun}(R) \subseteq \text{Fun}(P) \cup \text{Fun}(Q)$ such that $P \cup R$ and $P \cup Q$ are strongly equivalent is expressible as entailment between two first-order formulas. Moreover, if existence holds, such a program R can be effectively constructed, via a universal Craig-Lyndon interpolant of the left and the right side of the entailment.

Proof (Sketch). Like Theorem 12 but with applying the renaming of disallowed predicates not already at the program level but in the first-order encoding with considering polarity. Let V^\pm be the set of polarity/predicate pairs defined as $V^\pm \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{+p^0 \mid p \in V_+\} \cup \{+p^1 \mid p \in V_+ \cup V_{+1}\} \cup \{-p^0 \mid p \in V_-\} \cup \{-p^1 \mid p \in V_-\}$. The corresponding entailment underlying definability and LP-interpolation is then $S_F \wedge S_Q \wedge \gamma(P) \wedge \gamma(Q) \models \neg S'_P \vee \neg S'_Q \vee \neg \gamma(P)' \vee \gamma(Q)' \vee \neg Aux$, where the primed variations of formulas are obtained by replacing each predicate p that does not appear in V^\pm or appears in V^\pm with only a single polarity by a dedicated fresh predicate p' . (Note that negation and priming commute.) With $W \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Pred}^\pm(\neg S_P \vee \neg S_Q \vee \neg \gamma(P) \vee \gamma(Q))$ we define Aux as

$$\bigwedge_{+p \in V^\pm, -p \notin V^\pm, +p \in W} \forall \mathbf{x} (p(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow p'(\mathbf{x})) \wedge \bigwedge_{-p \in V^\pm, +p \notin V^\pm, -p \in W} \forall \mathbf{x} (p'(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow p(\mathbf{x})),$$

where \mathbf{x} matches the arity of the respective predicates p . □

In general, for first-order formulas F, G the second-order entailment $F \models \forall p G$, where p is a predicate, holds if and only if the first-order entailment $F \models G'$ holds, where G' is G with p replaced by a fresh predicate p' . This explains the construction of the right side of the entailment in the proof of Corollary 14 as an encoding of quantification upon (or “forgetting about”) a predicate only in a *single polarity*. With predicate quantification this can be expressed, e.g., for positive polarity, as $\exists +p G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \exists p' (G' \wedge \forall \mathbf{x} (p(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow p'(\mathbf{x})))$, where p' is a fresh predicate and G' is G with p replaced by p' . We illustrate the specification of Aux with an example.

Example 15. Assume that $+p \in V^\pm$ and $-p \notin V^\pm$. Let G stand for $S_P \wedge S_Q \wedge \gamma(P) \wedge \neg\gamma(Q)$ and let G' stand for G with all occurrences of p replaced by p' . For now we ignore the restrictions of Aux by W as they only have a heuristic purpose. The following statements, which are all equivalent to each other, illustrate the specification of Aux in a step-by-step fashion. We start with expressing the required “forgetting”. Since it appears in a negation, we have to forget here the “allowed” $+p$. (1) $F \models \neg\exists +p G$. (2) $F \models \neg\exists p' (G' \wedge \forall \mathbf{x} (p(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow p'(\mathbf{x})))$. (3) $F \models \forall p' (\neg G' \vee \neg\forall \mathbf{x} (p(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow p'(\mathbf{x})))$. (4) $F \models \neg G' \vee \neg\forall \mathbf{x} (p(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow p'(\mathbf{x}))$. (5) $F \models \neg G' \vee \neg Aux$.

Observing the restrictions by membership in W in the definition of Aux can result in a smaller formula Aux . Continuing the example, this can be illustrated as follows. Assume $+p \in V^\pm$ and $-p \notin V^\pm$ as before and in addition $+p \notin W$. Since $+p \notin W$ it follows that $-p \notin \text{Pred}^\pm(G)$. So “forgetting” about $+p$ in G is then just $\exists p' G'$ and the Aux component for p is not needed. (Also a further simplification, outlined in the remark below, is possible in this case.)

Remark 2. The view of “priming” as predicate quantification justifies a heuristically useful simplification of interpolation inputs for definability: If a predicate p occurs in a formula F only with positive (negative) polarity, then $\exists p F$ is equivalent to F with all atoms of the form $p(\mathbf{t})$ replaced by \top (\perp). Hence, if a predicate to be primed occurs only in a single polarity, we can replace all atoms with it by a truth value constant.

We now turn to application possibilities of Corollary 14. While it gives some control over the position of predicates, it does not allow to discriminate between allowing a predicate in negative heads and positive bodies. Predicates allowed in positive heads are also allowed in negative bodies. We give some examples.

Example 16. The following examples show for given programs P, Q and sets V_+, V_{+1}, V_- of predicates a possible value of R according to Corollary 14. In all the examples it is essential that a predicate is disallowed in R only in a single polarity. If it would not be allowed at all there would be no solution R .

$$(i) \quad \begin{array}{llll} P = \mathbf{p} \leftarrow \mathbf{q}. & Q = \mathbf{r} \leftarrow \mathbf{p}. & V_+ = \{\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}\} & R = \mathbf{r} \leftarrow \mathbf{p}. \\ & \mathbf{r} \leftarrow \mathbf{q}. & V_{+1} = \{\} & \mathbf{q} \leftarrow \mathbf{s}. \\ & \mathbf{q} \leftarrow \mathbf{s}. & V_- = \{\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}\} & \end{array}$$

Here \mathbf{q} is allowed in R in positive heads (and negative bodies) but not in positive bodies (and negative heads). Parentheses indicate constraints that apply but are not relevant for the example.

$$(ii) \quad P = p \leftarrow q. \quad Q = \leftarrow q, \mathbf{not} p. \quad V_+ = \{q, r, s\} \quad R = r \leftarrow q. \\ r \leftarrow q. \quad V_{+1} = \{\} \quad s \leftarrow p. \\ s \leftarrow p. \quad V_- = \{p, q, r, s\}$$

Here p is allowed in R in positive bodies (and negative heads) but not in negative bodies (and positive heads).

$$(iii) \quad P = p \leftarrow q. \quad Q = s \leftarrow \mathbf{not} r. \quad V_+ = \{s\} \quad R = s \leftarrow \mathbf{not} r. \\ r \leftarrow p. \quad r \leftarrow q. \quad V_{+1} = \{r\} \\ V_- = \{p, q, r, s\}$$

Here r is allowed in R in negative bodies and but not in positive heads.

4 Prototypical Implementation

We implemented the synthesis according to Theorem 12 and Corollary 14 prototypically with the PIE (*Proving, Interpolating, Eliminating*) environment [74,75], which is embedded in SWI-Prolog [78]. The implementation and all requirements are free software, see <http://cs.christophwernhard.com/pie/asp>.

For Craig-Lyndon interpolation there are several options, yielding different solutions for some problems. Proving can be performed by `CMProver`, a clausal tableaux/connection prover connection [8,9,46] included in PIE, similar to `PTTP` [69], `SETHEO` [47] and `leanCoP` [61], or by `Prover9` [58]. Interpolant extraction is performed on clausal tableaux following [76]. Resolution proofs by `Prover9` are first translated to tableaux with the *hyper* property, which allows to pass range-restriction and the Horn property from inputs to outputs of interpolation [77]. Optionally also proofs by `CMProver` can be transformed before interpolant extraction to ensure the hyper property. With `CMProver` it is possible to enumerate alternate interpolants extracted from alternate proofs. More powerful provers such as `E` [65] and `Vampire` [43] unfortunately do not emit gap-free proofs that would be suited for extracting interpolants.

The organization of the implementation closely follows the abstract exposition in Sect. 3, with Prolog predicates corresponding to theorems. For convenience in some applications, the predicate that realizes Theorem 12 and Corollary 14 permits to specify the vocabulary also complementary, by listing predicates not allowed in the result. In general, if outputs are largely *semantically* characterized, *simplifications* play a key role. Solutions with redundancies should be avoided, even if they are correct. This concerns all stages of our workflow: preparation of the interpolation inputs, choice or transformation of the proof used for interpolant extraction, interpolant extraction, the interpolant itself, and the first-order representation of the output program, where strong equivalence must be preserved, possibly modulo a background program. Although our system offers various simplifications at these stages, this seems an area for improvement with large impact for practice. Some particular issues only show up with experiments. For example, for both `CMProver` and `Prover9` a preprocessing of the right sides of the interpolation entailments to reduce the number of distinct variables that are Skolemized by the systems was necessary, even for relatively small inputs.

The application of first-order provers to interpolation for reformulation tasks is a rather unknown territory. Experiments with limited success are described in [4]. Our prototypical implementation covers the full range from the application task, synthesis of an answer set program for two given programs and a given vocabulary, to the actual construction of a result program via Craig-Lyndon interpolation by a first-order prover. At least for small inputs such as the examples in the paper it successfully produces results. We expect that with larger inputs from applications it at least helps to identify and narrow down the actual issues that arise for practical interpolation with current first-order proving technology. This is facilitated by the embedding into PIE, which allows easy interfacing to community standards, e.g., by exporting proving problems underlying interpolation in the *TPTP* [70] format.

5 Conclusion

We presented an effective variation of projective Beth definability based on Craig interpolation for answer set programs with respect to strong equivalence under the stable model semantics. Interpolation theorems for logic programs under stable models semantics were shown before in [1], where, however, programs are only on the left side of the entailment underlying interpolation, and the right side as well as the interpolant are just first-order formulas. Craig interpolation and Beth definability for answer set programs was considered in [31, 64], but with just existence results for equilibrium logic, which transfer to answer set semantics. The transfer of Craig interpolation and Beth definability from monotonic logics to default logics is investigated in [15], however, applicability to the stable model semantics and a relationship to strong equivalence are not discussed.

In [73] ontology-mediated querying over a knowledge base for specific description logics is considered, based on Beth definability and Craig interpolation. Interpolation is applied there to the Clark’s completion [19] of a Datalog program. Although completion semantics is a precursor of the stable model semantics, both agreeing on a subclass of programs, completion seems applied in [73] actually on program fragments, or on the “schema level”, as in our Examples 13.iv, 13.v and 13.vii. A systematic investigation of these forms of completion is on our agenda. *Forgetting* [22, 37] or, closely related, *uniform interpolation* and *second-order quantifier elimination* [30], may be seen as generalizing Craig interpolation: an expression is sought that captures exactly what a given expression says about a restricted vocabulary. A *Craig* interpolant is moreover related to a second given expression entailed by the first, allowing to extract it from a proof of the entailment.

We plan to extend our approach to classes of programs with practically important language extensions. Arithmetic expressions and comparisons in rule bodies are permitted in the language mini-GRINGO, used already in recent works on verifying strong equivalence [24, 26, 51]. We considered strong equivalence relative to a context *program P*. These contexts might be generalized to first-order theories that capture theory extensions of logic programs [13, 33, 41].

So far, our approach characterizes result programs syntactically by restricting allowed predicates and, to some degree, also their positions in rules. Can this be generalized? Restricting allowed functions, including constants, seems not possible: If a function occurs only in the left side of the entailment underlying Craig interpolation, the interpolant may have existentially quantified variables, making the conversion to a logic program impossible. From the interpolation side it is known that the Horn property and variations of range-restriction can be preserved [77]. It remains to be investigated, how this transfers to synthesizing logic programs, where in particular restrictions of the rule form and *safety* [14, 45], an important property related to range restriction, are of interest.

In addition to verifying strong equivalence, recent work addresses verifying further properties, e.g., *uniform* equivalence (equivalence under inputs expressed as ground facts) [24, 26, 52]. The approach is to use completion [19, 50] to express the verification problem in classical first-order logic. It is restricted to so-called *locally tight* logic programs [27]. Also forms of equivalence that abstract from “hidden” predicates are mostly considered for such restricted program classes, as relative equivalence [55], projected answer sets [23], or external behavior [24]. It remains future work to consider definability with uniform equivalence and hidden predicates, possibly using completion for translating logic programs to formulas (instead of γ), although it applies only to restricted classes of programs.

Independently from the application to program synthesis, our characterization of *encodes a program* and our procedure to extract a program from a formula suggest a novel practical method for transforming logic programs while preserving strong equivalence. The idea is as follows, where P is the given program: *First-order transformations* are applied to $F \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \gamma(P)$ to obtain a first-order formula F' such that $S_F \wedge F' \equiv S_F \wedge F$. For transformations that result in a universal formula, F' encodes a logic program, as argued in Remark 1. Applying the extraction procedure to F' then results in a program P' that is strongly equivalent to P . This makes the wide range of known first-order simplifications and formula transformations applicable and provides a firm foundation for soundness of special transformations. We expect that this approach supplements known dedicated simplifications that preserve strong equivalence [11, 23].

With its background in artificial intelligence research, answer set programming is a declarative approach to problem solving, where specifications are processed by automated systems. It is suitable for meta-level reasoning to verify properties of specifications and to synthesize new specifications. On the basis of a technique to verify an equivalence property of answer set programs we developed a synthesis technique. Our tools were Craig interpolation and Beth definability, fundamental insights about first-order logic that relate given formulas to further formulas characterized in certain ways. Practically realized with automated first-order provers, Craig interpolation and Beth definability become tools to synthesize formulas, and, as shown here, also answer set programs.

Acknowledgments. The authors thank anonymous reviewers for helpful suggestions to improve the presentation.

References

1. Amir, E.: Interpolation theorems for nonmonotonic reasoning systems. In: Flesca, S., Greco, S., Leone, N., Ianni, G. (eds.) JELIA 2002. LNCS (LNAI), vol. 2424, pp. 233–244. Springer (2002). https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45757-7_20
2. Artale, A., Jung, J.C., Mazzullo, A., Ozaki, A., Wolter, F.: Living without Beth and Craig: Definitions and interpolants in description and modal logics with nominals and role inclusions. *ACM Trans. Comp. Log.* **24**(4), 34:1–34:51 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3597301>
3. Baral, C.: Knowledge Representation, Reasoning and Declarative Problem Solving. Cambridge University Press (2010)
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. ACM (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3584372.3588653>
7. Beth, E.W.: On Padoa’s method in the theory of definition. *Indagationes Mathematicae* **15**, 330–339 (1953)
8. Bibel, W.: Automated Theorem Proving. Vieweg, Braunschweig (1987). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-322-90102-6>, first edition 1982
9. Bibel, W., Otten, J.: From Schütte’s formal systems to modern automated deduction. In: Kahle, R., Rathjen, M. (eds.) *The Legacy of Kurt Schütte*, pp. 215–249. Springer (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-49424-7_13
10. 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>
11. Brass, S., Dix, J.: Semantics of (disjunctive) logic programs based on partial evaluation. *J. Log. Prog.* **40**(1), 1–46 (1999). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0743-1066\(98\)10030-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0743-1066(98)10030-4)
12. Cabalar, P., Ferraris, P.: Propositional theories are strongly equivalent to logic programs. *Theory Pract. Log. Program.* **7**(6), 745–759 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1471068407003110>
13. Cabalar, P., Kaminski, R., Morkisch, P., Schaub, T.: *telingo* = ASP + time. In: Balduccini, M., Lierler, Y., Woltran, S. (eds.) LPNMR 2019. LNCS, vol. 11481, pp. 256–269. Springer (2019). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-20528-7_19
14. Cabalar, P., Pearce, D., Valverde, A.: A revised concept of safety for general answer set programs. In: Erdem, E., Lin, F., Schaub, T. (eds.) LPNMR 2009. LNCS, vol. 5753, pp. 58–70. Springer (2009). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-04238-6_8
15. Cassano, V., Fervari, R., Areces, C., Castro, P.F.: Interpolation and Beth definability in default logics. In: Calimeri, F., Leone, N., Manna, M. (eds.) JELIA 2019. LNCS (LNAI), vol. 11468, pp. 675–691. Springer (2019). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-19570-0_44
16. ten Cate, B., Conradie, W., Marx, M., Venema, Y.: Definitorially complete description logics. In: Doherty, P., Mylopoulos, J., Welty, C.A. (eds.) KR 2006. pp. 79–89. AAAI Press (2006), <http://www.aaai.org/Library/KR/2006/kr06-011.php>

17. ten Cate, B., Franconi, E., Seylan, I.: Beth definability in expressive description logics. *JAIR* **48**, 347–414 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1613/JAIR.4057>
18. Chen, Y., Lin, F., Li, L.: SELP - A system for studying strong equivalence between logic programs. In: Baral, C., Greco, G., Leone, N., Terracina, G. (eds.) *LPNMR 2005*. LNCS (LNAI), vol. 3662, pp. 442–446. Springer (2005). https://doi.org/10.1007/11546207_43
19. Clark, K.L.: Negation as failure. In: Gallaire, H., Minker, J. (eds.) *Logic and Data Bases*, vol. 1, pp. 293–322. Plenum Press, New York, NY (1978)
20. 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>
21. 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>
22. Delgrande, J.P.: A knowledge level account of forgetting. *JAIR* **60**, 1165–1213 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1613/JAIR.5530>
23. Eiter, T., Tompits, H., Woltran, S.: On solution correspondences in answer-set programming. In: Kaelbling, L.P., Saffioti, A. (eds.) *IJCAI-05*. pp. 97–102. Professional Book Center (2005), <http://ijcai.org/Proceedings/05/Papers/1177.pdf>
24. Fandinno, J., Hansen, Z., Lierler, Y., Lifschitz, V., Temple, N.: External behavior of a logic program and verification of refactoring. *Theory Pract. Log. Program.* **23**(4), 933–947 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1471068423000200>
25. Fandinno, J., Lifschitz, V.: On Heuer’s procedure for verifying strong equivalence. In: Gaggl, S.A., Martinez, M.V., Ortiz, M. (eds.) *JELIA 2023*. LNCS, vol. 14281, pp. 253–261. Springer (2023). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-43619-2_18
26. Fandinno, J., Lifschitz, V., Lühne, P., Schaub, T.: Verifying tight logic programs with anthem and Vampire. *Theory Pract. Log. Program.* **20**(5), 735–750 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1471068420000344>
27. Fandinno, J., Lifschitz, V., Temple, N.: Locally tight programs. *Theory Pract. Log. Program.* pp. 1–31 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S147106842300039X>
28. Ferraris, P., Lee, J., Lifschitz, V.: Stable models and circumscription. *Artif. Intell.* **175**(1), 236–263 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ARTINT.2010.04.011>
29. Fitting, M.: *First-Order Logic and Automated Theorem Proving*. Springer, 2nd edn. (1995). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-2360-3>
30. Gabbay, D.M., Schmidt, R.A., Szalas, A.: *Second-Order Quantifier Elimination: Foundations, Computational Aspects and Applications*. College Publications, London (2008)
31. Gabbay, D.M., Pearce, D., Valverde, A.: Interpolable formulas in equilibrium logic and answer set programming. *JAIR* **42**, 917–943 (2011), <https://jair.org/index.php/jair/article/view/10743>
32. Gebser, M., Harrison, A., Kaminski, R., Lifschitz, V., Schaub, T.: Abstract gringo. *Theory Pract. Log. Program.* **15**(4-5), 449–463 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1471068415000150>
33. Gebser, M., Kaminski, R., Kaufmann, B., Ostrowski, M., Schaub, T., Wanko, P.: Theory solving made easy with clingo 5. In: Carro, M., King, A., Saeedloei, N., Vos, M.D. (eds.) *ICLP 2016*. OASICS, vol. 52, pp. 2:1–2:15. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2016). <https://doi.org/10.4230/OASICS.ICLP.2016.2>
34. Gebser, M., Kaminski, R., Kaufmann, B., Schaub, T.: Multi-shot ASP solving with clingo. *Theory Pract. Log. Program.* **19**(1), 27–82 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1471068418000054>

35. Gelfond, M.: Answer sets. In: van Harmelen, F., Lifschitz, V., Porter, B.W. (eds.) *Handbook of Knowledge Representation, Foundations of Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 3. Elsevier (2008)
36. Gelfond, M., Lifschitz, V.: The stable model semantics for logic programming. In: Kowalski, R.A., Bowen, K.A. (eds.) *ICLP/SLP 1988*. pp. 1070–1080. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA (1988)
37. Gonçalves, R., Knorr, M., Leite, J.: Forgetting in answer set programming - A survey. *Theory Pract. Log. Program.* **23**(1), 111–156 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1471068421000570>
38. Heuer, J.: Automated Verification of Equivalence Properties in Advanced Logic Programs. Bachelor’s thesis, University of Potsdam (2020), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.19806>
39. Heuer, J.: Automated verification of equivalence properties in advanced logic programs. In: Schwarz, S., Wenzel, M. (eds.) *WLP 2023* (2023), https://dbs.informatik.uni-halle.de/wlp2023/WLP2023_Heuer_Automated%20Verification%20of%20Equivalence%20Properties%20in%20Advanced%20Logic%20Programs.pdf
40. 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>
41. Janhunen, T., Kaminski, R., Ostrowski, M., Schellhorn, S., Wanko, P., Schaub, T.: Clingo goes linear constraints over reals and integers. *Theory Pract. Log. Program.* **17**(5-6), 872–888 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1471068417000242>
42. Janhunen, T., Oikarinen, E.: LPEQ and DLPEQ - translators for automated equivalence testing of logic programs. In: Lifschitz, V., Niemelä, I. (eds.) *LP-NMR 2004*. LNCS (LNAI), vol. 2923, pp. 336–340. Springer (2004). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-24609-1_30
43. 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
44. 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>
45. Lee, J., Lifschitz, V., Palla, R.: Safe formulas in the general theory of stable models (preliminary report). In: de la Banda, M.G., Pontelli, E. (eds.) *ICLP 2008*. LNCS, vol. 5366, pp. 672–676. Springer (2008). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-89982-2_55
46. 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 Feb 5, 2024
47. 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>
48. Lifschitz, V.: Foundations of logic programming. In: Brewka, G. (ed.) *Principles of Knowledge Representation*, pp. 69–128. CSLI Publications (1996), <http://www.cs.utexas.edu/users/ai-lab?lif96b>
49. Lifschitz, V.: Thirteen definitions of a stable model. In: Blass, A., Dershowitz, N., Reisig, W. (eds.) *Fields of Logic and Computation, Essays Dedicated to Yuri Gurevich on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*. LNCS, vol. 6300, pp. 488–503. Springer (2010). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-15025-8_24

50. Lifschitz, V.: Answer Set Programming. Springer (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-24658-7>
51. Lifschitz, V.: Strong equivalence of logic programs with counting. *Theory Pract. Log. Program.* **22**(4), 573–588 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1471068422000278>
52. Lifschitz, V., Lühne, P., Schaub, T.: anthem: Transforming gringo programs into first-order theories (preliminary report). *CoRR* (2018), <http://arxiv.org/abs/1810.00453>
53. Lifschitz, V., Lühne, P., Schaub, T.: Verifying strong equivalence of programs in the input language of gringo. In: Balduccini, M., Lierler, Y., Woltran, S. (eds.) *LPNMR 2019*. LNCS, vol. 11481, pp. 270–283. Springer (2019). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-20528-7_20
54. Lifschitz, V., Pearce, D., Valverde, A.: Strongly equivalent logic programs. *ACM Trans. Comp. Log.* **2**(4), 526–541 (2001). <https://doi.org/10.1145/383779.383783>
55. Lin, F.: Reducing strong equivalence of logic programs to entailment in classical propositional logic. In: *KR-02*. pp. 170–176. Morgan Kaufmann (2002)
56. Lyndon, R.: An interpolation theorem in the predicate calculus. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* **9**, 129–142 (1959)
57. Marek, V.W., Truszczyński, M.: Stable models and an alternative logic programming paradigm. In: Apt, K.R., Marek, V.W., Truszczyński, M., Warren, D.S. (eds.) *The Logic Programming Paradigm - A 25-Year Perspective*, pp. 375–398. Artificial Intelligence, Springer (1999). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-60085-2_17
58. McCune, W.: Prover9 and Mace4 (2005–2010), <http://www.cs.unm.edu/~mccune/prover9>, accessed Feb 5, 2024
59. 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>
60. Niemelä, I.: Logic programs with stable model semantics as a constraint programming paradigm. *Ann. Math. Artif. Intell.* **25**(3-4), 241–273 (1999)
61. Otten, J.: Restricting backtracking in connection calculi. *AI Communications* **23**(2-3), 159–182 (2010). <https://doi.org/10.3233/AIC-2010-0464>
62. Pearce, D., Tompits, H., Woltran, S.: Characterising equilibrium logic and nested logic programs: Reductions and complexity. *Theory Pract. Log. Program.* **9**(05), 565–616 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S147106840999010X>
63. Pearce, D., Valverde, A.: Quantified equilibrium logic and foundations for answer set programs. In: de la Banda, M.G., Pontelli, E. (eds.) *ICLP 2008*. LNCS, vol. 5366, pp. 546–560. Springer (2008). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-89982-2_46
64. Pearce, D., Valverde, A.: Synonymous theories and knowledge representations in answer set programming. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* **78**(1), 86–104 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JCSS.2011.02.013>
65. 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
66. Segoufin, L., Vianu, V.: Views and queries: determinacy and rewriting. In: *PODS '05*. pp. 49–60. ACM (2005)
67. Slagle, J.R.: Interpolation theorems for resolution in lower predicate calculus. *JACM* **17**(3), 535–542 (1970). <https://doi.org/10.1145/321592.321604>
68. Smullyan, R.M.: *First-Order Logic*. Springer (1968), also republished with corrections by Dover publications, 1995

69. 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>
70. Sutcliffe, G.: The TPTP problem library and associated infrastructure. From CNF to TH0, TPTP v6.4.0. *J. Autom. Reasoning* **59**(4), 483–502 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10817-017-9407-7>
71. Takeuti, G.: *Proof Theory*. North-Holland, second edn. (1987)
72. Toman, D., Weddell, G.: *Fundamentals of Physical Design and Query Compilation*. Morgan & Claypool (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-01881-7>
73. Toman, D., Weddell, G.E.: First order rewritability in ontology-mediated querying in horn description logics. In: *AAAI 2022, IAAI 2022, EAAI 2022*. pp. 5897–5905. AAAI Press (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1609/AAAI.V36I5.20534>
74. 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>
75. 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*. *LNCS (LNAI)*, vol. 12057, pp. 160–177 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46714-2_11
76. 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>
77. Wernhard, C.: Range-restricted and Horn interpolation through clausal tableaux. In: Ramanayake, R., Urban, J. (eds.) *TABLEAUX 2023*. *LNCS (LNAI)*, vol. 14278, pp. 3–23. Springer (2023). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-43513-3_1
78. 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>