

trying to overbind mostly right away **does not look promising**

Definition 1 (Q). For a literal/clause φ , $Q(\varphi)$ denotes the quantifier block consisting of every lifting variable in φ with appropriate quantifier type. The order is yet to be defined \triangle

For $l \in C$ for $C \in \Gamma$: $Q(l) = \exists \bar{y}$
 For $l \in C$ for $C \in \Delta$: $Q(l) = \forall \bar{x}$

**basic axioms which should be fulfilled for a reasonable
procedure**

start

- $\Gamma \models \text{LI}_{\text{cl}}(C)$
 $\Gamma = \{P(f(x))\} \Rightarrow \text{LI}_{\text{cl}}(C) \stackrel{\text{must be}}{=} \exists x P(x)$
 $\Gamma = \{\neg P(f(x))\} \Rightarrow \text{LI}_{\text{cl}}(C) \stackrel{\text{must be}}{=} \exists x \neg P(x)$
- $\Delta \models ?$

inferences LI is always basically just Γ -part

always want: $\Gamma \models \text{LI}$, $\Delta \models \neg \text{LI}$

- $\Gamma : P(f(x)) \Rightarrow \exists x P(x)$
 $\Delta : \neg P(y) \Rightarrow \forall y \neg P(x)$
- $\Gamma : \neg P(f(x)) \Rightarrow \exists x \neg P(x)$
 $\Delta : P(y) \Rightarrow \forall y P(x)$
- $\Gamma : \neg P(x) \Rightarrow \forall x \neg P(x)$
 $\Delta : P(g(y)) \Rightarrow \exists y P(y)$
- $\Gamma : P(x) \Rightarrow \forall x P(x)$
 $\Delta : \neg P(g(y)) \Rightarrow \neg \exists y P(y)$

but must not tear apart $P(x) \vee \neg P(x)$ to $\forall x P(x) \vee \forall x \neg P(x)$

example for “var does not occur in clause any more-condition”:

$$\frac{R(f(z)) \quad \neg R(x) \vee P(x)}{\neg R(x) \mid P(x)}$$

Note that $(\forall y_{f(x)} \neg R(y_{f(x)})) \vee P(x)$ is not valid!

attempt for a definition

Definition 2 (LI).

Base case.

For $l \in C$ for $C \in \Gamma \cup \Delta$: $Q(l)\ell[C] \in \text{LI}_{\text{cl}}(C)$

LI as usual

Resolution.

Definition 3 (χ : lifting with quantification on literal level).

$$\chi(F \circ G) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \chi(F) \circ \chi(G)$$

$$\chi(\neg G) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \neg \chi(G)$$

$$\chi(Q(\lambda)\lambda) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Q(\lambda\sigma)\lambda\sigma$$

where $Q(\lambda\sigma)$ is $Q(\lambda)$ with quantifiers and lifting variables for additional maximal colored terms introduced by σ into λ \triangle

$$\text{LI}_{\text{cl}} C \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \chi(\text{LI}_{\text{cl}}(C_1) \setminus \{l_{\text{LI}_{\text{cl}}}\}) \vee \chi(\text{LI}_{\text{cl}}(C_2) \setminus \{l'_{\text{LI}_{\text{cl}}}\})$$

$$1. \text{ If } l \text{ is } \Gamma\text{-colored: } \text{LI}(C) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \chi(\text{LI}(C_1)) \vee \chi(\text{LI}(C_2))$$

$$2. \text{ If } l \text{ is } \Delta\text{-colored: } \text{LI}(C) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \chi(\text{LI}(C_1)) \wedge \chi(\text{LI}(C_2))$$

$$3. \text{ If } l \text{ is grey: } \text{LI}(C) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (l_{\text{LI}_{\text{cl}}} \tau \wedge \text{LI}(C_2)\tau) \vee (\neg \ell[l'_{\text{LI}_{\text{cl}}}\tau] \wedge \ell[\text{LI}(C_1)\tau])$$

\triangle

Conjectured Lemma 4. $\Gamma \models \text{LI}(C) \vee \text{LI}_{\text{cl}}(C)$

Proof. Start works.

Step:

resolved literals: have same coloring

IH:

$$\Gamma \models \text{LI}(C_1) \vee \text{LI}_{\text{cl}}(C_1^*) \vee l_{\text{LI}_{\text{cl}}}$$

$$\Gamma \models \text{LI}(C_2) \vee \text{LI}_{\text{cl}}(C_2^*) \vee l'_{\text{LI}_{\text{cl}}}$$

\square

overbind just within thigh constraints

^(A) **Lemma 5.** *If a variable does occurs in \bar{C} but does not in C , then it is not modified by any mgu of a subsequent inference.*

2.1 naive interpolant extraction based on 5

Definition 6 (LI with stepwise prenex interplants but globally non-prenex ones).

Base case.

For $l \in C$ for $C \in \Gamma \cup \Delta$: $C \in \text{LI}_{\text{cl}}(C)$

LI as usual

Resolution.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LI}_{\text{cl}}(C) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{LI}_{\text{cl}}(C_1) \setminus \{l_{\text{LIcl}}\} \sigma \vee \text{LI}_{\text{cl}}(C_2) \setminus \{l'_{\text{LIcl}}\} \sigma \\ &\Rightarrow \text{LI}_{\text{cl}}(C) = C \end{aligned}$$

$\chi(F)$: lift all terms which do contain a variable which do not contain variables which occur in $\text{LI}_{\text{cl}}(C)$ and quantify prenex

TODO: not sure where we can quantify ground terms as they can be added arbitrarily (possibly lift every occurrence of a ground term t distinctly)

TODO: need not be prenex here

1. If l is Γ -colored: $\text{LI}(C) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \chi(\text{LI}(C_1) \vee \text{LI}(C_2)) \sigma$
2. If l is Δ -colored: $\text{LI}(C) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \chi(\text{LI}(C_1) \wedge \text{LI}(C_2)) \sigma$
3. If l is grey: $\text{LI}(C) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (l_{\text{LIcl}} \sigma \text{LI}(C_2)) \tau \vee (\neg l'_{\text{LIcl}} \wedge \text{LI}(C_1)) \sigma$

\triangle

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma &\models \text{LI}(C) \vee C \\ (\Delta &\models \neg \text{LI}(C) \vee C) \end{aligned}$$

2.2 lifting only Δ -terms in this way for now

Conjectured Lemma 7. $\Gamma \models \text{LI}^\Delta(C) \vee C$

Proof. induction on strenghtening, as always.

$$C_\Gamma = C_1^* \Gamma \vee C_2^* \Gamma$$

IH:

$$\Gamma \models \text{LI}^\Delta(C_1) \vee C_1^* \Gamma \vee l_\Gamma$$

$$\Gamma \models \text{LI}^\Delta(C_2) \vee C_2^* \Gamma \vee \neg l'_\Gamma$$

Hence:

$$\Gamma \models (\text{LI}^\Delta(C_1) \vee C_1^* \Gamma \vee l_\Gamma) \sigma$$

$$\Gamma \models (\text{LI}^\Delta(C_2) \vee C_2^* \Gamma \vee \neg l'_\Gamma) \sigma$$

Supp grey:

$$\Gamma \models (l \wedge \text{LI}^\Delta(C_2)) \sigma \vee (l' \wedge \text{LI}^\Delta(C_1)) \sigma \vee C_\Gamma$$

$$\Gamma \models \text{LI}^\Delta(C) \vee C_\Gamma$$

???

□

$$X = \text{LV}(\text{LI}^\Delta(C)) \setminus \text{LV}(\text{LI}_{\text{cl}}^\Delta(C_\Gamma))$$

X' : take from X those lifting variables, which contain variables which do not occur in C (this is safer than only $\text{LI}_{\text{cl}}^\Delta(C)$)

$$Y = \text{LV}(\ell_\Gamma[\text{LI}^\Delta(C)])$$

$$Y' = \{z_t \in Y \mid t \text{ contains a variable which does not occur in } C\}$$

$$\text{From other pdf: } \Gamma \models \text{LI}^\Delta(C) \vee \text{LI}_{\text{cl}}^\Delta(C)$$

$$\text{Hence } \Gamma \models (Q(Y') \text{LI}^\Delta(C)) \vee \text{LI}_{\text{cl}}^\Delta(C)$$

2.3 random ideas

– we can pull apart existentially quantified variables: $\exists x(P(x) \vee Q(x))$ implies $\exists xP(x) \vee \exists yP(y)$. this does not work with universally quantified variables $(P(f(x)) \vee \neg P(f(x)))$