

# Temporal Equilibrium Logic with Past Operators

Felicidad Aguado<sup>a</sup>, Pedro Cabalar<sup>a\*\*</sup>, Martín Diéguez<sup>b</sup>  
Gilberto Pérez<sup>a</sup> and Concepción Vidal<sup>a\*\*†</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Computer Science,  
University of Corunna (Spain)

{aguado,cabalar,gperez,eicovima}@udc.es

<sup>b</sup> IRIT, CNRS, University of Toulouse, France  
martin.dieguez@irit.fr

today

## Abstract

In this paper we study the introduction of modal past temporal operators in Temporal Equilibrium Logic (TEL), an hybrid formalism that mixes linear-time modalities and logic programs interpreted under stable models and their characterisation in terms of Equilibrium Logic. We show that Kamp's translation can also be used to translate the new extension of TEL with past operators into Quantified Equilibrium Logic. Additionally, we provide a method for removing past operators that consists in replacing past-time subformulas by fresh auxiliary atoms, obtaining an equivalent formula, modulo the original alphabet.

## 1 Introduction

Many scenarios of commonsense reasoning require the combination of two central dimensions in Knowledge Representation (KR): Temporal Reasoning and Non-Monotonic Reasoning (NMR). Due to the strong connection between NMR and Logic Programming (LP), one interesting strategy is to rely on the literature on (temporal) modal extensions of LP. This research area dates back to the eighties with several approaches (see survey by Orgun and Ma (1994)), starting with the seminal work by Luis Fariñas del Cerro Fariñas del Cerro (1986) on the MOLOG system, that introduced different types of modalities into Prolog. Other extensions (Abadi & Manna, 1989; Gabbay, 1987b; Orgun & Wadge,

---

\*\*Corresponding author. Email: [cabalar@udc.es](mailto:cabalar@udc.es)

†\*\*This work has been partially supported by the Spanish project TIN2013-42149-P. Martín Diéguez was supported by the Centre international de mathématiques et d'informatique (contract ANR-11-LABX-0040-CIMI).

1992) were specifically focused on enriching LP with temporal modalities as those handled in *Linear-time Temporal Logic* (LTL) (Kamp, 1968; Pnueli, 1977):  $\square$  standing for “always,”  $\diamond$  standing for “eventually” or  $\circ$  standing for “next.” However, most of them imposed some syntactic restrictions and disregarded the use of default negation. For instance, the system TEMPLOG (Abadi & Manna, 1989) introduced a particular syntax where temporal modalities only affect formulas in the rule body, in a restricted manner, to the rule itself. An example of a TEMPLOG rule is:

$$\square(p \leftarrow \circ q \wedge \diamond r) \tag{1}$$

As shown in (Baudinet, 1992), this syntax had the semantic advantage of yielding a unique, least Herbrand model for any TEMPLOG program, as happens with positive logic programs in the non-temporal case. Unfortunately, these syntactic limitations make its use not very suitable in KR. On the one hand, the absence of default negation is a serious drawback that prevents the representation of defaults and NMR. On the other hand, even if we focus on the temporal perspective, the way in which modal operators are used in TEMPLOG is not natural in terms of a commonsense description of a dynamic domain. Take the rule (1) as an example. This expression may make sense under a top-down Prolog reading: at any moment, to fulfil goal  $p$  we need to satisfy  $q$  at the next state and  $r$  at some point in the future. However, if we use a bottom-up reading, more common in causal laws used in action languages, (1) would assert that if  $q$  holds at the next state and  $r$  occurs in a future situation, then  $p$  is always caused to be true now. What makes an expression of this kind look unnatural is that, excepting in science fiction scripts<sup>1</sup>, commonsense causal laws normally describe the cause-effect relations from past to future, not the other way around. For instance, if we want to express that pushing a button lights a lamp in the next situation, unless we can prove that it is broken, we would require a rule like:

$$\square(\circ light \leftarrow push \wedge \neg broken) \tag{2}$$

which cannot be represented in TEMPLOG, since it does not allow rule heads with  $\circ$  or  $\diamond$  operators, and cannot deal with default negation  $\neg$ .

Part of the syntactic limitations present in the temporal LP approaches from the eighties were mostly due to the fact that a satisfactory semantics for default negation in (non-temporal) LP was not successfully proposed until the last part of the decade. Gelfond and Lifschitz (1988) defined the *stable model* semantics that eventually gave rise to a new LP paradigm called *Answer Set Programming* (ASP) (Marek & Truszczyński, 1999; Niemelä, 1999), becoming nowadays one of the most successful frameworks for practical problem solving and KR. Moreover, as shown by Pearce (1997), stable models can be logically characterised in terms of *Equilibrium Logic*, a formalism that defines a model selection criterion for the

<sup>1</sup>As an interesting formal classification of time-travel narratives, see (Morgenstern, 2014).

(monotonic) intermediate logic of *Here-and-There* (HT) (Heyting, 1930). The equilibrium logic characterisation has eventually allowed the definition of stable models (Ferraris, Lee, & Lifschitz, 2007) for arbitrary theories without syntactic limitations.

In principle, the extension of HT to the temporal case could be designed as an example of intuitionistic (or intermediate) modal approach, as in (Fischer Servi, 1977) and also studied by Fariñas del Cerro and Raggio (1983). In order to obtain a temporal extension of Equilibrium Logic, one further needs to generalise the model minimisation from the latter to temporal (intuitionistic) interpretations. Such an extension of Equilibrium Logic to incorporate LTL modal operators was, in fact, proposed in a series of papers (Aguado, Cabalar, Diéguez, Pérez, & Vidal, 2013; Cabalar, 2015; Cabalar & Pérez, 2007) under the name of *Temporal Equilibrium Logic* (TEL). TEL defines a temporal stable model semantics for any arbitrary theory, and so, it allows free combinations of the temporal operators and LP constructs. In this way, (2) is now representable in TEL and behaves like a standard ASP program containing the rules:

$$light(I + 1) \leftarrow push(I), \neg broken(I)$$

for any integer  $I \geq 0$ . Moreover, we can represent other expressions that are not representable in ASP (unless we add auxiliary atoms) such as:

$$\Box(\Box\Diamond light \leftarrow push \wedge \neg broken)$$

meaning this time that the light will be eventually on, but perhaps with a delay of  $n \geq 1$  of situations. Although a prover has been built (Cabalar & Diéguez, 2014) to compute temporal stable models for arbitrary (propositional) temporal theories, such a syntactic flexibility is not so much exploited in practice. If we look at the usual encoding of action scenarios in TEL, rules like (1) (directed from future to past) simply do not occur. In fact, this has led to the definition of a particular syntactic subset, called *splittable* (Aguado, Cabalar, Pérez, & Vidal, 2011) temporal logic programs, where formulas are constraints like  $\Box(\perp \leftarrow \varphi)$  or have the form:

$$\Box(\Box\alpha \leftarrow \Box\beta \wedge \gamma) \tag{3}$$

where  $\alpha$  is a disjunction of literals (an atom or its negation), and  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  are conjunctions of literals. For instance, (2) is in splittable form. The temporal stable models for a splittable program can always be captured as the classical LTL models of a temporal formula<sup>2</sup> and so can be computed (Cabalar & Diéguez, 2011) using an LTL model checker as a backend.

Splittable programs cover most examples of transition-based action domains in the literature and allow an arbitrary use of temporal operators in constraints. However, their expressiveness for describing causal laws is limited to (3) where the use of temporal operators is rather restrictive. Moreover, as discussed before,

<sup>2</sup>This result holds for splittable programs, but not for arbitrary theories, as shown in (Bozzelli & Pearce, 2016).

even if they are extended to allow more expressive operators in the rule body, as in (1), the expressions we obtain seem awkward because they would describe causation from future to past.

A more natural choice for handling expressive modalities in causal laws would be *using past operators* in the rule bodies (that express the law precondition) and using future operators for the rule heads or for the constraints describing the valid narratives. As an example, suppose that the lamp takes a pair of situations to “warm up” if we pushed the button for the first time:

$$\Box(\Box\Box\textit{light} \leftarrow \textit{push} \wedge \Box\neg\textit{push}) \quad (4)$$

where  $\Box$  stands for “it has always been true.” Of course, we can represent this example without past operators if we introduce an auxiliary predicate to remember that *push* has been true before:

$$\begin{aligned} \Box(\Box\Box\textit{light} &\leftarrow \textit{push} \wedge \neg\textit{pushed}) \\ \Box(\Box\textit{pushed} &\leftarrow \textit{push}) \\ \Box(\Box\textit{pushed} &\leftarrow \textit{pushed}) \end{aligned}$$

However, in the general case, past operators allow much more flexible and compact queries on the past narrative without the need of introducing auxiliary atoms, which may become a potential source of errors in the specification.

Another justification for the introduction of past operators relies on the fact that recent implementations of ASP solvers for incremental (Gebser, Sabuncu, & Schaub, 2011) and stream reasoning (Gebser et al., 2012) which allow multiple-shot execution of the solver, can exploit the search done in previous shots if the time variable in the rules refers to the current instant in the head and previous instants in the body. For instance, for this purpose, we would rather be interested in representing (4) as the equivalent formula:

$$\Box(\textit{light} \leftarrow \Theta\Theta(\textit{push} \wedge \Box\neg\textit{pushed}))$$

where  $\Theta$  means “in the previous state.”

It has been proved (Gabbay, 1987a; Gabbay, Pnueli, Shelah, & Stavi, 1980) that LTL with past operators can be translated into an equivalent pure future formula evaluated at the beginning of the path. Still, as shown in (Markey, 2003), any LTL with past is exponentially more succinct<sup>3</sup> than pure-future LTL.

In this paper, we consider an extension of TEL (and THT) to include past operators and show that this extension can be reduced to pure future TEL by a translation that introduces auxiliary atoms.

## 2 Temporal Equilibrium Logic with past operators

We proceed now to define the syntax and semantics of the extension of Temporal Equilibrium Logic with past operators.

<sup>3</sup>Assuming that no auxiliary atoms are introduced.

## 2.1 Syntax

The logic of *Linear Temporal Here-and-There* (THT) is defined as follows. We start from a finite set of atoms  $V$  called the *propositional signature*. The syntax of THT is the one from propositional LTL which we recall below. A temporal formula  $\varphi$  in language  $\mathcal{L}_V$  is defined as:

$$\varphi ::= \perp \mid p \mid \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \mid \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2 \mid \varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2 \mid \bigcirc \varphi_1 \mid \square \varphi_1 \mid \diamond \varphi_1 \mid \varphi_1 \mathcal{U} \varphi_2 \mid \varphi_1 \mathcal{R} \varphi_2 \mid \widehat{\Theta} \varphi_1 \mid \Theta \varphi_1 \mid \boxplus \varphi_1 \mid \boxminus \varphi_1 \mid \varphi_1 \mathcal{S} \varphi_2 \mid \varphi_1 \mathcal{T} \varphi_2$$

where  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$  are temporal formulas in their turn and  $p$  is any atom. Negation is defined as  $\neg \varphi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varphi \rightarrow \perp$  whereas  $\top \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \neg \perp$ . Note that ‘ $\neg$ ’ will stand for *default negation* in all non-monotonic formalisms described in this paper. The rest of unary temporal modalities can be defined in terms of  $\mathcal{U}$ ,  $\mathcal{R}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \diamond \varphi &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \top \mathcal{U} \varphi & \square \varphi &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \perp \mathcal{R} \varphi \\ \boxminus \varphi &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \top \mathcal{S} \varphi & \boxplus \varphi &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \perp \mathcal{T} \varphi \end{aligned}$$

The intuitive reading of these operators is as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \varphi \mathcal{U} \psi &= \text{“}\varphi \text{ until } \psi\text{”} & \varphi \mathcal{S} \psi &= \text{“}\varphi \text{ since } \psi\text{”} \\ \varphi \mathcal{R} \psi &= \text{“}\varphi \text{ releases } \psi\text{”} & \varphi \mathcal{T} \psi &= \text{“}\varphi \text{ triggers } \psi\text{”} \\ \square \varphi &= \text{“forever } \varphi\text{”} & \boxplus \varphi &= \text{“}\varphi \text{ always held”} \\ \diamond \varphi &= \text{“eventually } \varphi\text{”} & \boxminus \varphi &= \text{“}\varphi \text{ held at some moment”} \\ \bigcirc \varphi &= \text{“next } \varphi\text{”} & \Theta \varphi &= \text{“if not initial, then previous } \varphi\text{”} \\ & & \widehat{\Theta} \varphi &= \text{“there is a previous } \varphi\text{”} \end{array}$$

We define the following notation for a finite concatenation of  $\bigcirc$ ’s and  $\Theta$ ’s operators as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcirc^0 \varphi &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varphi & \bigcirc^i \varphi &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcirc(\bigcirc^{i-1} \varphi) \quad (\text{with } i \geq 1) \\ \Theta^0 \varphi &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varphi & \Theta^i \varphi &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Theta(\Theta^{i-1} \varphi) \quad (\text{with } i \geq 1) \end{aligned}$$

## 2.2 Semantics

An *LTL-interpretation* is an infinite sequence of sets of atoms  $H_0, H_1, \dots$  with  $H_i \subseteq \text{At}$ ,  $i \geq 0$ . Given two LTL-interpretations  $\mathbf{H}$  and  $\mathbf{T}$ , we write  $\mathbf{H} \leq \mathbf{T}$  to stand for  $H_i \subseteq T_i$  for all  $i \geq 0$ . As usual,  $\mathbf{H} < \mathbf{T}$  represents  $\mathbf{H} \leq \mathbf{T}$  and  $\mathbf{H} \neq \mathbf{T}$ , that is, the inclusion relation holds in all states but is strict  $H_j \subset T_j$  for some  $j \geq 0$ . A *THT-interpretation*  $\mathbf{M}$  is a pair of LTL-interpretations  $\mathbf{M} = \langle \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{T} \rangle$ , respectively standing for *here* and *there*, such that  $\mathbf{H} \leq \mathbf{T}$ . An interpretation  $\mathbf{M} = \langle \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{T} \rangle$  is said to be *total* when  $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{T}$ .

**Definition 2.1 (THT-Satisfaction)** *We say that an interpretation  $\mathbf{M} = \langle \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{T} \rangle$  satisfies a formula  $\varphi$  at state  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , written  $\mathbf{M}, k \models \varphi$ , when the following recursive conditions hold:*

1.  $\mathbf{M}, k \models p$  iff  $p \in H_k$ , for any  $p \in At$ .
2.  $\mathbf{M}, k \models \varphi \wedge \psi$  iff  $\mathbf{M}, k \models \varphi$  and  $\mathbf{M}, k \models \psi$ .
3.  $\mathbf{M}, k \models \varphi \vee \psi$  iff  $\mathbf{M}, k \models \varphi$  or  $\mathbf{M}, k \models \psi$ .
4.  $\mathbf{M}, k \models \varphi \rightarrow \psi$  iff for all  $\mathbf{H}' \in \{\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{T}\}$ ,  $\langle \mathbf{H}', \mathbf{T} \rangle, k \not\models \varphi$  or  $\langle \mathbf{H}', \mathbf{T} \rangle, k \models \psi$ .
5.  $\mathbf{M}, k \models \circ\varphi$  iff  $\mathbf{M}, k+1 \models \varphi$ .
6.  $\mathbf{M}, k \models \widehat{\ominus}\varphi$  iff  $\begin{cases} \mathbf{M}, k-1 \models \varphi & \text{if } k > 0 \\ \text{false} & \text{if } k = 0 \end{cases}$
7.  $\mathbf{M}, k \models \ominus\varphi$  iff  $\begin{cases} \mathbf{M}, k-1 \models \varphi & \text{if } k > 0 \\ \text{true} & \text{if } k = 0 \end{cases}$
8.  $\mathbf{M}, k \models \varphi \mathcal{U} \psi$  iff there is  $j \geq k$  s.t.  $\mathbf{M}, j \models \psi$  and  $\mathbf{M}, i \models \varphi$  for all  $i, k \leq i < j$ .
9.  $\mathbf{M}, k \models \varphi \mathcal{R} \psi$  iff for all  $j \geq k$  s.t.  $\mathbf{M}, j \models \psi$  or  $\mathbf{M}, i \models \varphi$  for some  $i, k \leq i < j$ .
10.  $\mathbf{M}, k \models \varphi \mathcal{S} \psi$  iff there is  $j, 0 \leq j \leq k$  s.t.  $\mathbf{M}, j \models \psi$  and  $\mathbf{M}, i \models \varphi$  for all  $i, j < i \leq k$ .
11.  $\mathbf{M}, k \models \varphi \mathcal{T} \psi$  iff for all  $j, 0 \leq j \leq k$  s.t.  $\mathbf{M}, j \models \psi$  or  $\mathbf{M}, i \models \varphi$  for some  $i, j < i \leq k$ .
12. never  $\mathbf{M}, k \models \perp$ . \(\boxtimes\)

In particular, the following LTL valid formulas are also THT valid:

$$\varphi \mathcal{U} \psi \leftrightarrow \psi \vee (\varphi \wedge \circ(\varphi \mathcal{U} \psi)) \quad (5)$$

$$\varphi \mathcal{R} \psi \leftrightarrow \psi \wedge (\varphi \vee \circ(\varphi \mathcal{R} \psi)) \quad (6)$$

$$\varphi \mathcal{S} \psi \leftrightarrow \psi \vee (\varphi \wedge \ominus(\varphi \mathcal{S} \psi)) \quad (7)$$

$$\varphi \mathcal{T} \psi \leftrightarrow \psi \wedge (\varphi \vee \ominus(\varphi \mathcal{T} \psi)) \quad (8)$$

A formula  $\varphi$  is THT-valid if  $\mathbf{M}, 0 \models \varphi$  for any  $\mathbf{M}$ . An interpretation  $\mathbf{M}$  is a THT-model of a theory  $\Gamma$ , written  $\mathbf{M} \models \Gamma$ , if  $\mathbf{M}, 0 \models \varphi$ , for every formula  $\varphi \in \Gamma$ . It is not difficult to see that THT-satisfaction for a total interpretation  $\langle \mathbf{T}, \mathbf{T} \rangle$  collapses to LTL-satisfaction for  $\mathbf{T}$ . As a result:

**Observation 1**  $\langle \mathbf{T}, \mathbf{T} \rangle \models \Gamma$  in THT if and only if  $\mathbf{T} \models \Gamma$  in LTL. \(\boxtimes\)

Some total models will be said to be *in equilibrium* if they satisfy the following minimality condition in their “here” component.

**Definition 2.2 (temporal equilibrium model)** A total THT-interpretation  $\langle \mathbf{T}, \mathbf{T} \rangle$  is a temporal equilibrium model of a theory  $\Gamma$  if  $\langle \mathbf{T}, \mathbf{T} \rangle \models \Gamma$  and there is no  $\mathbf{H} < \mathbf{T}$ , such that  $\langle \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{T} \rangle \models \Gamma$ . \(\boxtimes\)

Since a temporal equilibrium model is a total model  $\langle \mathbf{T}, \mathbf{T} \rangle$ , by Observation 1, it corresponds to an LTL model  $\mathbf{T}$  we will call *temporal stable model*.

**Definition 2.3 (temporal stable model)** If  $\langle \mathbf{T}, \mathbf{T} \rangle$  is a temporal equilibrium model of a theory  $\Gamma$  then  $\mathbf{T}$  is called a temporal stable model of  $\Gamma$ . \(\boxtimes\)

We can alternatively represent any interpretation  $\mathbf{M} = \langle \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{T} \rangle$  by seeing each  $m_i = \langle H_i, T_i \rangle$  as a three-valued mapping  $m_i : V \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$  so that, for any atom  $p$ ,  $m_i(p) = 0$  when  $p \notin T_i$  (the atom is false),  $m_i(p) = 2$  when  $p \in H_i$  (the atom is true), and  $m_i(p) = 1$  when  $p \in T_i \setminus H_i$  (the atom is undefined). We can then define a valuation for any formula  $\varphi$ , written<sup>4</sup>  $\mathbf{M}(\varphi)$ , by similarly considering which formulas are satisfied by  $\langle \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{T} \rangle$  (which will be assigned 2), not satisfied by  $\langle \mathbf{T}, \mathbf{T} \rangle$  (which will be assigned 0) or none of the two (which will take value 1). By  $\mathbf{M}_i(\varphi)$  we mean the 3-valuation of  $\varphi$  induced by the temporal interpretation  $\mathbf{M}_i$ , that is,  $\mathbf{M}$  shifted  $i$  positions.

**Definition 2.4** *From the definitions in the previous section, we can easily derive the following conditions:*

1.  $\mathbf{M}_i(\perp) = 0$
2.  $\mathbf{M}_i(p) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} m_i(p)$
3.  $\mathbf{M}_i(\varphi \wedge \psi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min\{\mathbf{M}_i(\varphi), \mathbf{M}_i(\psi)\}$ ;  $\mathbf{M}_i(\varphi \vee \psi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max\{\mathbf{M}_i(\varphi), \mathbf{M}_i(\psi)\}$
4.  $\mathbf{M}_i(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } \mathbf{M}_i(\varphi) \leq \mathbf{M}_i(\psi) \\ \mathbf{M}_i(\psi) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
5.  $\mathbf{M}_i(\circ\varphi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{M}_{i+1}(\varphi)$
6.  $\mathbf{M}_i(\ominus\varphi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \mathbf{M}_{i-1}(\varphi) & \text{if } i > 0 \\ 2 & \text{if } i = 0 \end{cases}$
7.  $\mathbf{M}_i(\widehat{\ominus}\varphi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \mathbf{M}_{i-1}(\varphi) & \text{if } i > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } i = 0 \end{cases}$
8.  $\mathbf{M}_i(\varphi \mathcal{U} \psi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max\{ \min\{\mathbf{M}_j(\psi), \mathbf{M}_k(\varphi) \mid i \leq k < j\} \mid j \geq i \}$
9.  $\mathbf{M}_i(\varphi \mathcal{R} \psi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min\{ \max\{\mathbf{M}_j(\psi), \mathbf{M}_k(\varphi) \mid i \leq k < j\} \mid j \geq i \}$
10.  $\mathbf{M}_i(\varphi \mathcal{S} \psi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max\{ \min\{\mathbf{M}_j(\psi), \mathbf{M}_k(\varphi) \mid j < k \leq i\} \mid j \leq i \}$
11.  $\mathbf{M}_i(\varphi \mathcal{T} \psi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min\{ \max\{\mathbf{M}_j(\psi), \mathbf{M}_k(\varphi) \mid j < k \leq i\} \mid j \leq i \}$

Under this alternative three-valued definition, an interpretation  $\mathbf{M}$  *satisfies* a formula  $\varphi$  when  $\mathbf{M}(\varphi) = 2$ . When  $\mathbf{M} = \langle \mathbf{T}, \mathbf{T} \rangle$ , its induced valuation will be just written as  $\mathbf{T}(\varphi)$  and obviously becomes a two-valued function, that is  $\mathbf{T}(\varphi) \in \{0, 2\}$ . A pair of useful observations:

---

<sup>4</sup>We use the same name  $\mathbf{M}$  for a temporal interpretation and for its induced three-valued valuation function – ambiguity is removed by the way in which it is applied (a structure or a function on formulas).

**Observation 2** Given  $\mathbf{M} = \{\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{T}\}$  and a pair of formulas  $\varphi, \psi$ , if  $\mathbf{M}(\varphi) = \mathbf{M}(\psi)$  then also  $\mathbf{T}(\varphi) = \mathbf{T}(\psi)$ .  $\square$

**Observation 3** For any interpretation  $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{M} \models \varphi \leftrightarrow \psi$  iff  $\mathbf{M}(\varphi) = \mathbf{M}(\psi)$  whereas,  $\mathbf{M} \models \Box(\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi)$  iff for all  $i \geq 0$ ,  $\mathbf{M}_i(\varphi) = \mathbf{M}_i(\psi)$ .

**Example 2.1 (from (Markey, 2003))** While in TEL we can express, for instance, that any request is eventually granted:

$$\Box(\text{request} \rightarrow \Diamond \text{grant})$$

with past-time modalities, we can express that a grant should be preceded by a request

$$\Box(\text{grant} \rightarrow \Diamond \text{request})$$

### 3 Translating TEL into Quantified Equilibrium Logic

*Quantified Equilibrium Logic* (Pearce & Valverde, 2008) (QEL) extends Equilibrium Logic to the first-order case. As in the propositional setting, QEL defines a selection of models among those from the monotonic logic of *Quantified Here and There* (QHT).

The definition of QHT is based on a first order language denoted by  $\mathcal{L} = \langle C, F, P \rangle$ , where  $C$ ,  $F$  and  $P$  are three disjoint sets that represent constants, functions and predicates, respectively. Variables will only be used in the scope of a quantifier: in other words, we assume closed formulas (sentences). Given a domain  $D$  we define the sets:

- $At_D(C, P)$  stands for all ground atoms that can be formed from  $\langle C \cup D, F, P \rangle$ .
- $T_D(C, F)$  all ground terms that can be obtained from  $\langle C \cup D, F, P \rangle$ .

A *QHT-interpretation* is a tuple  $\mathcal{M} = \langle (D, \sigma), I_h, I_t \rangle$  such that

- $\sigma : T_D(C, F) \rightarrow D$  is a mapping from ground terms into elements of the domain satisfying that  $\sigma(d) = d$  if  $d \in D$
- $I_h, I_t$  are two sets of ground atoms from  $At_D(C, P)$  such that  $I_h \subseteq I_t$

We assume here a version of QHT taking *static* (or *uniform*) domain and *decidable* equality. Briefly, this means that the domain  $D$  is common to worlds  $h$  and  $t$  and that equality is a “decidable” predicate, that is, it satisfies the excluded middle axiom  $(x = y) \vee \neg(x = y)$ . Given two QHT interpretations,  $\mathcal{M} = \langle (D, \sigma), I_h, I_t \rangle$  and  $\mathcal{M}' = \langle (D', \sigma'), I'_h, I'_t \rangle$ , we say that  $\mathcal{M} \leq \mathcal{M}'$  iff  $D = D'$ ,  $\sigma = \sigma'$ ,  $I_t = I'_t$  and  $I_h \subseteq I'_h$ . If, additionally,  $I_h \subset I'_h$  we say that the relation is strict (denoted by  $\mathcal{M} < \mathcal{M}'$ ).



**Definition 3.1 (QHT semantics from (Pearce & Valverde, 2008))** *The satisfaction relation for a QHT interpretation  $\mathcal{M} = \langle (D, \sigma), I_h, I_t \rangle$  is defined as follows:*

- $\mathcal{M} \models \top$ ,  $\mathcal{M} \not\models \perp$
- $\mathcal{M} \models p(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n)$  iff  $p(\sigma(\tau_1), \dots, \sigma(\tau_n)) \in I_h$
- $\mathcal{M} \models \tau = \tau'$  iff  $\sigma(\tau) = \sigma(\tau')$ .
- $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi \wedge \psi$  iff  $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi$  and  $\mathcal{M} \models \psi$
- $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi \vee \psi$  iff  $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi$  or  $\mathcal{M} \models \psi$
- $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi \rightarrow \psi$  iff  $\mathcal{M} \not\models \varphi$  or  $\mathcal{M} \models \psi$ , and  $\langle (D, \sigma), I_t, I_t \rangle \models \varphi \rightarrow \psi$
- $\mathcal{M} \models \forall x, \varphi(x)$  iff  $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(d)$ , for all  $d \in D$
- $\mathcal{M} \models \exists x, \varphi(x)$  iff  $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(d)$ , for some  $d \in D$  □

As usual, we say that a QHT-interpretation  $\mathcal{M}$  is a *model* of a first order theory  $\Gamma$  iff  $\mathcal{M} \models \phi$  for all  $\phi \in \Gamma$ .

**Definition 3.2 (quantified equilibrium model from (Pearce & Valverde, 2008))**

*Let  $\varphi$  be a QHT formula. A QHT total interpretation  $\mathcal{M}$  is a first-order equilibrium model of  $\varphi$  if  $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi$  and there is no model  $\mathcal{M}' < \mathcal{M}$  of  $\varphi$ . □*

For our purposes, it is convenient to define a particular subclass of QHT theories. We define the fragment of QHT called *monadic here-and-there with inequality*,  $\text{MHT}(\leq)$ , by syntactically restricting all predicates to monadic, excepting a binary predicate  $\leq$ . Moreover, we also fix the domain  $D$  to be the set of natural numbers  $D = \mathbb{N}$  so that  $\leq$  captures the standard ordering among them. We consider the time constant 0 to stand for the initial situation. Given that both the domain and the interpretation of  $\leq$  are fixed, interpretations will only vary for ground atoms in  $\text{At}(\mathbb{N}, P)$ , that is, those formed with the set of monadic predicates  $P$  and elements from  $\mathbb{N}$ . Then,  $\text{MHT}(\leq)$  interpretations can be simply given by pairs  $\langle \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{T} \rangle$  with  $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{T} \subseteq \text{At}(\mathbb{N}, P)$ . As usual, we write  $x > y$  to stand for  $\neg(x \leq y)$ . We will also use the following abbreviations:

$$\begin{aligned}
\forall x \geq t. \varphi &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \forall x(t \leq x \rightarrow \varphi) \\
\exists x \geq t. \varphi &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \exists x(t \leq x \wedge \varphi) \\
\forall x \in [t, z]. \varphi &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \forall x(t \leq x \wedge x < z \rightarrow \varphi) \\
\exists x \in [t, z]. \varphi &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \exists x(t \leq x \wedge x < z \wedge \varphi)
\end{aligned}$$

Fragment  $\text{MHT}(\leq)$  imposes exactly the same restrictions on QHT than the so-called *monadic first-order logic with inequality*,  $\text{FOL}(\leq)$ , does on classical First-Order Logic (FOL). This subclass of FOL was used by Kamp (1968) in his famous theorem where he proved that LTL is exactly as expressive as  $\text{FOL}(\leq)$ , so

that we can actually see the former as a fragment of FOL. This result was separated into two directions: proving that LTL can be translated into FOL( $\leq$ ) and vice versa. For the first direction, Kamp defined the following translation from modal formulas into quantified first-order expressions:

**Definition 3.3 (Kamp's translation)** *Kamp's translation for a temporal formula  $\varphi$  and a timepoint  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , denoted by  $[\varphi]_t$ , is recursively defined as follows:*

- $[\perp]_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \perp$
- $[p]_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} p(t)$ , with  $p \in At$ .
- $[\neg\alpha]_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \neg[\alpha]_t$
- $[\alpha \wedge \beta]_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [\alpha]_t \wedge [\beta]_t$
- $[\alpha \vee \beta]_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [\alpha]_t \vee [\beta]_t$
- $[\alpha \rightarrow \beta]_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [\alpha]_t \rightarrow [\beta]_t$
- $[\bigcirc\alpha]_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [\alpha]_{t+1}$
- $[\alpha \mathcal{U} \beta]_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \exists x \geq t. ([\beta]_x \wedge \forall y \in [t, x). [\alpha]_y)$
- $[\alpha \mathcal{R} \beta]_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \forall x \geq t. ([\beta]_x \vee \exists y \in [t, x). [\alpha]_y)$
- $[\ominus\alpha]_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} [\alpha]_{t-1} & \text{if } t > 0 \\ \top & \text{if } t = 0 \end{cases}$
- $[\widehat{\ominus}\alpha]_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} [\alpha]_{t-1} & \text{if } t > 0 \\ \perp & \text{if } t = 0 \end{cases}$
- $[\alpha \mathcal{S} \beta]_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \exists 0 \leq x \leq t. ([\beta]_x \wedge \forall y \in (x, t]. [\alpha]_y)$
- $[\alpha \mathcal{T} \beta]_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \forall 0 \leq x \leq t. ([\beta]_x \vee \exists y \in (x, t]. [\alpha]_y)$

□

Note how, per each atom  $p \in At$  in the temporal formula  $\varphi$ , we get a monadic predicate  $p(x)$  in the translation.

The effect of this translation on the derived operators  $\diamond$ ,  $\square$ ,  $\diamond$  and  $\boxplus$  yields the quite natural expressions:

$$\begin{aligned} [\square\alpha]_t &\equiv \forall x \geq t. [\alpha]_x & [\diamond\alpha]_t &\equiv \exists x \geq t. [\alpha]_x \\ [\boxplus\alpha]_t &\equiv \forall x \leq t. [\alpha]_x & [\diamond\alpha]_t &\equiv \exists x \leq t. [\alpha]_x \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 3.4 (THT-MHT( $\leq$ ) interpretation correspondence)** *Given a THT interpretation  $\mathbf{M} = \langle \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{T} \rangle$  on a signature (set of atoms)  $V$ , we say that the MHT( $\leq$ )-interpretation  $\mathcal{M} = \langle \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{T} \rangle$  corresponds to  $\mathbf{M}$  iff*

- $p \in H_i$  iff  $p(i) \in \mathcal{H}$ , for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ .
- $p \in T_i$  iff  $p(i) \in \mathcal{T}$ , for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . □

We now prove that when considering this model correspondence, Kamp's translation allows us to translate a THT theory into a corresponding QHT one.

**Theorem 3.1** *Let  $\varphi$  be a THT formula built on a set of atoms  $V$ ,  $\mathbf{M} = \langle \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{T} \rangle$  a THT-interpretation on  $V$  and  $\mathcal{M} = \langle \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{T} \rangle$  its corresponding MHT( $\leq$ )-interpretation from Definition 3.4. It holds that:  $\forall i \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}, i \models \varphi$  iff  $\mathcal{M} \models [\varphi]_i$ . □*

*Proof.* We proceed by structural induction.

- If  $\varphi = \perp$  then  $[\varphi]_i = \perp$  and the result is straightforward.
- If  $\varphi = p$  is an atom, then  $[p]_i = p(i)$  and we get the chain of equivalent conditions:  $\mathbf{M}, i \models p \Leftrightarrow p \in H_i \Leftrightarrow p(i) \in \mathcal{H} \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{M} \models p(i)$ .
- If  $\varphi = \alpha \wedge \beta$  we get:
 
$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}, i \models \alpha \wedge \beta &\Leftrightarrow \mathbf{M}, i \models \alpha \text{ and } \mathbf{M}, i \models \beta \\ &\Leftrightarrow \mathcal{M} \models [\alpha]_i \text{ and } \mathcal{M} \models [\beta]_i && \text{(applic. of the induction hyp. on } \alpha, \beta) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \mathcal{M} \models [\alpha]_i \wedge [\beta]_i \\ &\Leftrightarrow \mathcal{M} \models [\alpha \wedge \beta]_i \end{aligned}$$
- The proof for  $\varphi = \alpha \vee \beta$  is analogous to the one for  $\alpha \wedge \beta$ .
- If  $\varphi = \alpha \rightarrow \beta$  we get:
 
$$\mathbf{M}, i \models \alpha \rightarrow \beta \Leftrightarrow \text{for any } \mathbf{H}' \in \{\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{T}\}, \langle \mathbf{H}', \mathbf{T} \rangle, i \not\models \alpha \text{ or } \langle \mathbf{H}', \mathbf{T} \rangle, i \models \beta$$

Now, since the THT-interpretation  $\langle \mathbf{T}, \mathbf{T} \rangle$  also corresponds to the MHT( $\leq$ ) interpretation  $\langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T} \rangle$  we can apply the induction hypothesis on the subformulas, so that we continue with the equivalent conditions:

(for any  $\mathcal{H}' \in \{\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{T}\}$ ,  $\langle \mathcal{H}', \mathcal{T} \rangle \not\models [\alpha]_i$  or  $\langle \mathcal{H}', \mathcal{T} \rangle \models [\beta]_i \Leftrightarrow (\langle \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{T} \rangle \models [\alpha \rightarrow \beta]_i)$ ).

- If  $\varphi = \circ\alpha$  we get the equivalent conditions:
 
$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}, i \models \circ\alpha &\Leftrightarrow \mathbf{M}, i+1 \models \alpha \\ &\Leftrightarrow \mathcal{M} \models [\alpha]_{i+1} && \text{(by applying the induction hypothesis)} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \mathcal{M} \models [\circ\alpha]_i \end{aligned}$$
- If  $\varphi = \ominus\alpha$  and  $i > 0$  we get the equivalent conditions:
 
$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}, i \models \ominus\alpha &\Leftrightarrow \mathbf{M}, i-1 \models \alpha \\ &\Leftrightarrow \mathcal{M} \models [\alpha]_{i-1} && \text{(by applying the induction hypothesis)} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \mathcal{M} \models [\ominus\alpha]_i \end{aligned}$$

If  $i = 0$  then  $\mathbf{M}, 0 \models \ominus\alpha$ , whereas  $\mathcal{M} \models [\ominus\alpha]_0 = \top$  is also trivially true.

- If  $\varphi = \widehat{\Theta}\alpha$ , the case for  $i > 0$  is treated as in the previous proof for  $\Theta\alpha$  whereas, if  $i = 0$ , we get that  $\mathbf{M}, 0 \models \Theta\alpha$  is false, whereas  $\mathcal{M} \models [\widehat{\Theta}\alpha]_0 = \perp$  is also trivially false.
- If  $\varphi = \alpha \mathcal{U} \beta$  we get the equivalent conditions:
 
$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}, i \models \alpha \mathcal{U} \beta &\Leftrightarrow \exists k \text{ s.t. } k \geq i \text{ and } \mathbf{M}, k \models \beta \text{ and } \forall j \in \{i, \dots, k-1\}, \mathbf{M}, j \models \alpha \\ &\Leftrightarrow \exists k \text{ s.t. } k \geq i \text{ and } \mathcal{M} \models [\beta]_k \text{ and } \forall j \in \{i, \dots, k-1\}, \mathcal{M} \models [\alpha]_j^1 \\ &\Leftrightarrow \exists k \text{ s.t. } k \geq i \text{ and } \mathcal{M} \models [\beta]_k \text{ and } \forall j \text{ if } i \leq j < k \text{ then } \mathcal{M} \models [\alpha]_j \\ &\Leftrightarrow \mathcal{M} \models [\alpha \mathcal{U} \beta]_i. \end{aligned}$$

Here we applied the induction hypothesis on  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ .

- The proof for  $\varphi = \alpha \mathcal{R} \beta$  is analogous to the one for  $\alpha \mathcal{U} \beta$ .
- If  $\varphi = \alpha \mathcal{S} \beta$  we get the equivalent conditions:
 
$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}, i \models \alpha \mathcal{S} \beta &\Leftrightarrow \exists k \text{ s.t. } 0 \leq k \leq i \text{ and } \mathbf{M}, k \models \beta \text{ and } \forall j \in \{k+1, \dots, i\}, \mathbf{M}, j \models \alpha \\ &\Leftrightarrow \exists k \text{ s.t. } 0 \leq k \leq i \text{ and } \mathcal{M} \models [\beta]_k \text{ and } \forall j \in \{k+1, \dots, i\}, \mathcal{M} \models [\alpha]_j^2 \\ &\Leftrightarrow \exists k \text{ s.t. } 0 \leq k \leq i \text{ and } \mathcal{M} \models [\beta]_k \text{ and } \forall j \text{ if } k < j \leq i \text{ then } \mathcal{M} \models [\alpha]_j \\ &\Leftrightarrow \mathcal{M} \models [\alpha \mathcal{S} \beta]_i. \end{aligned}$$

As happens in the proof for the operator  $\mathcal{U}$ , this step of the proof came from the application of the induction hypothesis on  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ .

- The proof for  $\varphi = \alpha \mathcal{T} \beta$  is analogous to the one for  $\alpha \mathcal{S} \beta$ .

**Corollary 3.1** *Let  $\mathbf{T}$  be a temporal interpretation,  $\mathcal{T}$  its corresponding first-order interpretation and  $\varphi$  some temporal formula. Then,  $\mathbf{T}$  is a temporal stable model of  $\varphi$  iff  $\mathcal{T}$  is a stable model of  $[\varphi]_0$ .  $\square$*

## 4 Removing past operators

In this section we introduce a method to remove past operators that relies on replacing each past-time subformula  $\chi$  by a new fresh atom (or label)  $\mathbf{L}_\chi$  whose truth is fixed by a set of additional future-time formulas. Replacing subformulas by fresh atoms is a standard technique originally introduced by Tseitin (1968) and well-known in automated theorem proving (Nonnengart & Weidenbach, 2001) where it is normally used to avoid exponential size blowup when transforming formulas into normal form.

We begin observing the following equivalences.

**Proposition 4.1** *For any THT formulas  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  built on the signature  $V$ , and any THT interpretation  $\mathbf{M}$ , the following holds:*

- (T. 1)  $\mathbf{M}, 0 \models \Theta\varphi \leftrightarrow \top$
- (T. 2)  $\mathbf{M}, 0 \models \widehat{\Theta}\varphi \leftrightarrow \perp$
- (T. 3)  $\mathbf{M}, 0 \models \varphi \mathcal{S} \psi \leftrightarrow \psi$

(T. 4)  $\mathbf{M}, 0 \models \varphi\mathcal{T}\psi \leftrightarrow \psi$

(T. 5)  $\models \circ\Theta\varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi$

(T. 6)  $\models \circ(\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi) \leftrightarrow (\circ\psi \vee (\circ\varphi \wedge \varphi\mathcal{S}\psi))$

(T. 7)  $\models \circ(\varphi\mathcal{T}\psi) \leftrightarrow (\circ\psi \wedge (\circ\varphi \vee \varphi\mathcal{T}\psi))$ .

*Proof.* (T. 1)-(T. 4) follow directly from Definition 2.1. We prove next the tautologies (T. 5)-(T. 7) below. For any  $i \geq 0$ ,

(T. 5) We follow the equivalent conditions:

$$\mathbf{M}_i(\circ\Theta\varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi) = 2 \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{M}_i(\circ\Theta\varphi) = \mathbf{M}_i(\varphi) \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{M}_{i+1}(\Theta\varphi) = \mathbf{M}_i(\varphi) \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{M}_i(\varphi) = \mathbf{M}_i(\varphi)$$

(T. 6) Again, we use a chain of equivalent conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_i(\circ(\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi) \leftrightarrow (\circ\psi \vee (\circ\varphi \wedge \varphi\mathcal{S}\psi))) &= 2 \\ \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{M}_i(\circ(\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi)) &= \mathbf{M}_i(\circ\psi \vee (\circ\varphi \wedge \varphi\mathcal{S}\psi)) \\ \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{M}_i(\circ(\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi)) &= \max\{\mathbf{M}_{i+1}(\psi), \min\{\mathbf{M}_{i+1}(\varphi), \mathbf{M}_i(\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi)\}\} \\ \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{M}_i(\circ(\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi)) &= \max\{\mathbf{M}_{i+1}(\psi), \min\{\mathbf{M}_{i+1}(\varphi), \mathbf{M}_{i+1}(\Theta(\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi))\}\} \\ \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{M}_i(\circ(\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi)) &= \max\{\mathbf{M}_{i+1}(\psi), \mathbf{M}_{i+1}(\varphi \wedge \Theta(\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi))\} \\ \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{M}_i(\circ(\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi)) &= \mathbf{M}_{i+1}(\psi \vee (\varphi \wedge \Theta(\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi))). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by (7) we conclude that  $\mathbf{M}_i(\circ(\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi)) = \mathbf{M}_{i+1}(\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi)$ , which is true.

(T. 7) We use the equivalent conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_i(\circ(\varphi\mathcal{T}\psi) \leftrightarrow (\circ\psi \wedge (\circ\varphi \vee \varphi\mathcal{T}\psi))) &= 2 \\ \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{M}_i(\circ(\varphi\mathcal{T}\psi)) &= \mathbf{M}_i(\circ\psi \wedge (\circ\varphi \vee \varphi\mathcal{T}\psi)) \\ \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{M}_i(\circ(\varphi\mathcal{T}\psi)) &= \min\{\mathbf{M}_{i+1}(\psi), \max\{\mathbf{M}_{i+1}(\varphi), \mathbf{M}_i(\varphi\mathcal{T}\psi)\}\} \\ \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{M}_i(\circ(\varphi\mathcal{T}\psi)) &= \min\{\mathbf{M}_{i+1}(\psi), \max\{\mathbf{M}_{i+1}(\varphi), \mathbf{M}_{i+1}(\Theta(\varphi\mathcal{T}\psi))\}\} \\ \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{M}_i(\circ(\varphi\mathcal{T}\psi)) &= \min\{\mathbf{M}_{i+1}(\psi), \mathbf{M}_{i+1}(\varphi \vee \Theta(\varphi\mathcal{T}\psi))\} \\ \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{M}_i(\circ(\varphi\mathcal{T}\psi)) &= \mathbf{M}_{i+1}(\psi \wedge (\varphi \vee \Theta(\varphi\mathcal{T}\psi))). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by (8) we conclude that  $\mathbf{M}_i(\circ(\varphi\mathcal{T}\psi)) = \mathbf{M}_{i+1}(\varphi\mathcal{T}\psi)$ , which is true.

Let  $\gamma$  be an arbitrary formula with a past subformula  $\chi$ . We define the replacement of  $\chi$  by label (fresh atom)  $\mathbf{L}_\chi$ , written  $\gamma_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^\chi$ , in the following recursive way.

**Definition 4.1 (Labelling)** Let  $\gamma$  and  $\chi$  be two THT formulas in  $\mathcal{L}_V$  such that the latter is of the form  $\ominus\varphi$ ,  $\widehat{\ominus}\varphi$ ,  $\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi$  or  $\varphi\mathcal{T}\psi$ . We define  $\gamma_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^x$  on  $V_{\mathbf{L}} = V \cup \{\mathbf{L}_\chi\}$ , with  $\mathbf{L}_\chi$  being a fresh atom, as follows:

$$\gamma_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^x = \begin{cases} \perp & \text{if } \gamma = \perp \\ p & \text{if } \gamma = p \in V \\ \circ\varphi_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^x & \text{if } \gamma = \circ\varphi \\ \varphi_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^x \odot \psi_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^x & \text{if } \gamma = \varphi \odot \psi \text{ and } \odot \in \{\wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{R}\} \\ \ominus(\varphi_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^x) & \text{if } \gamma = \ominus\varphi \text{ and } \gamma \neq \chi \\ \widehat{\ominus}(\varphi_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^x) & \text{if } \gamma = \widehat{\ominus}\varphi \text{ and } \gamma \neq \chi \\ (\varphi_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^x) \mathcal{S} (\psi_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^x) & \text{if } \gamma = \varphi\mathcal{S}\psi \text{ and } \gamma \neq \chi \\ (\varphi_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^x) \mathcal{T} (\psi_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^x) & \text{if } \gamma = \varphi\mathcal{T}\psi \text{ and } \gamma \neq \chi \\ \mathbf{L}_\chi & \text{if } \gamma = \chi \end{cases} \quad \boxtimes$$

If we replace  $\chi$  by the new atom  $\mathbf{L}_\chi$ , the latter may have an arbitrary meaning. To make  $\mathbf{L}_\chi$  play the role of the original formula  $\chi$ , we will add the formula:

$$df(\chi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \Box(\circ\mathbf{L}_\chi \leftrightarrow \varphi) \wedge (\mathbf{L}_\chi \leftrightarrow \top) & \text{if } \gamma = \ominus\varphi; \\ \Box(\circ\mathbf{L}_\chi \leftrightarrow \varphi) \wedge (\mathbf{L}_\chi \leftrightarrow \perp) & \text{if } \gamma = \widehat{\ominus}\varphi; \\ \Box(\circ\mathbf{L}_\chi \leftrightarrow \circ\psi \vee (\circ\varphi \wedge \mathbf{L}_\chi)) \wedge (\mathbf{L}_\chi \leftrightarrow \psi) & \text{if } \gamma = (\varphi \mathcal{S} \psi); \\ \Box(\circ\mathbf{L}_\chi \leftrightarrow \circ\psi \wedge (\circ\varphi \vee \mathbf{L}_\chi)) \wedge (\mathbf{L}_\chi \leftrightarrow \psi) & \text{if } \gamma = (\varphi \mathcal{T} \psi). \end{cases}$$

Our goal now is to prove that  $\gamma_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^x \wedge df(\chi)$  and  $\gamma$  are equivalent, modulo the original alphabet. To this aim, for each interpretation  $\mathbf{M}$  for the original alphabet  $V$ , we consider the interpretation  $\mathbf{M}^e$  for the extended alphabet  $V_{\mathbf{L}} = V \cup \{\mathbf{L}_\chi\}$  that fixes the truth of  $\mathbf{L}_\chi$ , to be precise,  $M(\chi)$ .

**Definition 4.2** Given a THT formula  $\chi$  in  $\mathcal{L}_V$ , of the form  $\ominus\varphi$ ,  $\widehat{\ominus}\varphi$ ,  $\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi$  or  $\varphi\mathcal{T}\psi$  and a THT interpretation (in three-valued form)  $\mathbf{M}$ , we denote by  $\mathbf{M}^e$  the following THT interpretation built on  $V_{\mathbf{L}} = V \cup \{\mathbf{L}_\chi\}$ :

$$\mathbf{M}_i^e(p) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{M}_i(\chi) & \text{if } p = \mathbf{L}_\chi \\ \mathbf{M}_i(p) & \text{if } p \in V \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

$\boxtimes$

From Proposition 4.1 and the definition of  $\mathbf{M}^e$ , it is easy to determine that  $df(\chi)$  is always true in  $\mathbf{M}^e$ .

**Lemma 4.1** Let  $\gamma$  and  $\chi$  be two THT formulas in  $\mathcal{L}_V$  such that the latter is of the form  $\ominus\varphi$ ,  $\widehat{\ominus}\varphi$ ,  $\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi$  or  $\varphi\mathcal{T}\psi$ . If  $\mathbf{M}$  is a model of  $\gamma$  then the THT interpretation on  $V_{\mathbf{L}}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}^e$  defined before satisfies that  $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}^e \cap V$  and also  $\mathbf{M}^e \models \gamma_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^x \wedge df(\chi)$ .

*Proof.*

For any atom  $p \in V$  and  $i \geq 0$ ,  $\mathbf{M}_i^e(p) = \mathbf{M}_i(p)$ , thus, the valuations for atoms in  $\mathbf{M}$  and  $\mathbf{M}^e$  coincide, which means that  $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}^e \cap V$ . Furthermore, since  $\gamma$  does not have labels and  $\mathbf{M} \models \gamma$ . From this and (9) it follows that  $\mathbf{M}_0(\gamma) = \mathbf{M}_0^e(\gamma) = 2$ .

On the other hand, if  $\gamma = \chi$  we get that  $\mathbf{M}_0^e(\gamma_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^X) = \mathbf{M}_0^e(\mathbf{L}_\chi) = \mathbf{M}_0(\chi) = 2$ .

To prove that  $\mathbf{M}^e$  satisfies the translation, it remains to be shown that  $\mathbf{M}^e \models df(\gamma)$ . This proof comes directly from Proposition 4.1 and the fact that  $\mathbf{M}_i^e(\mathbf{L}_\chi) = \mathbf{M}_i(\chi)$ , for all  $i \geq 0$ .

The following lemma shows that, under interpretation  $\mathbf{M}^e$ , formulas  $\gamma_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^X$  and  $\gamma$  are interchangeable.

**Lemma 4.2** *Let  $\gamma$  be a THT formula in  $\mathcal{L}_V$  and  $\mathbf{M}$  a THT interpretation such that*

$$\mathbf{M}^e \models \gamma_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^X \wedge df(\chi).$$

*For any THT formula  $\chi$  of the form  $\ominus\varphi$ ,  $\widehat{\ominus}\varphi$ ,  $\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi$  or  $\varphi\mathcal{T}\psi$  and any  $i \geq 0$ , the following property holds:*

$$\mathbf{M}_i^e(\gamma_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^X) = \mathbf{M}_i^e(\gamma).$$

*Proof.* We use structural induction on  $\gamma$ .

1. When the subformula  $\gamma$  has the shape  $\top$ ,  $\perp$  or an atom  $p$  this is trivial, since  $\gamma_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^X = \gamma$  by definition.
2. When  $\gamma = \varphi \bullet \psi$  for any connective  $\bullet \in \{\wedge, \vee, \rightarrow\}$ , then the proof follows from Definition 2.4 and by applying the induction hypothesis on  $\varphi_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^X$  and  $\psi_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^X$ .

To finish the proof, notice that  $df(\chi)$  is always true in  $\mathbf{M}^e$ .

3. When  $\gamma = \circ\varphi$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_i^e((\circ\varphi)_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^X) &= \mathbf{M}_i^e(\circ\varphi_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^X) \\ &= \mathbf{M}_{i+1}^e(\varphi_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^X) \\ &= \mathbf{M}_{i+1}^e(\varphi) \quad (\text{induction}) \\ &= \mathbf{M}_i^e(\circ\varphi) \end{aligned}$$

4.  $\gamma = (\varphi \mathcal{U} \psi)$ : we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_i^e((\varphi \mathcal{U} \psi)_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^X) &= \mathbf{M}_i^e((\varphi)_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^X \mathcal{U} (\psi)_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^X) \\ &= \max\{\min\{\mathbf{M}_j^e(\psi_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^X), \mathbf{M}_k^e(\varphi_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^X) \mid i \leq k < j\} \mid j \geq i\} \\ &= \max\{\min\{\mathbf{M}_j^e(\psi), \mathbf{M}_k^e(\varphi) \mid i \leq k < j\} \mid j \geq i\} \quad (\text{induction}) \\ &= \mathbf{M}_i^e(\varphi \mathcal{U} \psi) \end{aligned}$$

5. The proof for  $\gamma = \varphi\mathcal{R}\psi$  is similar to the one presented in the previous case.

6.  $\gamma = \ominus\varphi$ : here we must consider two cases; when  $\gamma \neq \chi$  and  $\gamma = \chi$ . In the former case proceed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_i^e((\ominus\varphi)_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^\chi) &= \mathbf{M}_i^e(\ominus(\varphi)_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^\chi) && (\gamma \neq \chi) \\ &= \mathbf{M}_{i-1}^e((\varphi)_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^\chi) \\ &= \mathbf{M}_{i-1}^e(\varphi) && (\text{induction}) \\ &= \mathbf{M}_i^e(\ominus\varphi) \end{aligned}$$

while if  $\ominus\varphi = \chi$  and  $i = 0$ , we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_0^e((\ominus\varphi)_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^\chi) &= \mathbf{M}_0^e(\mathbf{L}_\chi) && (\chi = \gamma) \\ &= \mathbf{M}_0^e(\top) && df(\chi) \\ &= \mathbf{M}_0^e(\ominus\varphi). && ((T. 1) \text{ from Prop. 4.1}) \end{aligned}$$

When  $i > 0$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_i^e((\ominus\varphi)_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^\chi) &= \mathbf{M}_i^e(\mathbf{L}_\chi) && (\chi = \gamma) \\ &= \mathbf{M}_{i-1}^e(\circ\mathbf{L}_\chi) \\ &= \mathbf{M}_{i-1}^e(\varphi) && df(\chi) \\ &= \mathbf{M}_i^e(\ominus\varphi) && (\text{Definition 2.4}) \end{aligned}$$

7.  $\gamma = \widehat{\ominus}\varphi$ : following the same reasoning as above, for the cases  $\gamma \neq \chi$  and  $\gamma = \chi$  (with  $i > 0$ ), the argument we used coincides with the case  $\gamma = \ominus\varphi$ . The proof for the remaining case,  $\gamma = \chi$  and  $i = 0$  is presented below:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_0^e((\widehat{\ominus}\varphi)_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^\chi) &= \mathbf{M}_0^e(\mathbf{L}_\chi) && (\chi = \gamma) \\ &= \mathbf{M}_0^e(\perp) && df(\chi) \\ &= \mathbf{M}_0^e(\widehat{\ominus}\varphi) && ((T. 2) \text{ from Prop. 4.1}) \end{aligned}$$

8.  $\gamma = \varphi\mathcal{S}\psi$ : as in the previous cases, if  $\gamma \neq \chi$  we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_i^e((\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi)_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^\chi) &= \mathbf{M}_i^e((\varphi)_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^\chi \mathcal{S} (\psi)_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^\chi) && (\chi \neq \gamma) \\ &= \max\{\min\{\mathbf{M}_j^e(\psi)_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^\chi, \mathbf{M}_k^e(\varphi)_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^\chi \mid j < k \leq i\} \mid j \leq i\} \\ &= \max\{\min\{\mathbf{M}_j^e(\psi), \mathbf{M}_k^e(\varphi) \mid j < k \leq i\} \mid j \leq i\} && (\text{induction}) \\ &= \mathbf{M}_i^e(\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if  $\gamma = \chi$  and  $i = 0$ , we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_0^e((\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi)_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^\chi) &= \mathbf{M}_0^e(\mathbf{L}_\chi) && (\chi = \gamma) \\ &= \mathbf{M}_0^e(\psi) && df(\chi) \\ &= \mathbf{M}_0^e(\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi). && ((T. 3) \text{ from Prop. 4.1}) \end{aligned}$$

However, in the case  $i > 0$  we can only prove that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_i^e((\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi)_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^\chi) &= \mathbf{M}_i^e(\mathbf{L}_\chi) && (\chi = \gamma) \\ &= \mathbf{M}_{i-1}^e(\circ\mathbf{L}_\chi) \\ &= \mathbf{M}_{i-1}^e(\circ\psi \vee (\circ\varphi \wedge \mathbf{L}_\chi)) && (df(\chi)) \\ &= \max\{\mathbf{M}_{i-1}^e(\circ\psi), \min\{\mathbf{M}_{i-1}^e(\circ\varphi), \mathbf{M}_{i-1}^e(\mathbf{L}_\chi)\}\} \\ &= \max\{\mathbf{M}_i^e(\psi), \min\{\mathbf{M}_i^e(\varphi), \mathbf{M}_{i-1}^e(\mathbf{L}_\chi)\}\}. \end{aligned}$$



Unfortunately, we cannot get rid of  $\mathbf{L}_\chi$ , since  $\chi$  itself is the formula to be proved in the induction step. To prove that  $\mathbf{M}_i^e(\mathbf{L}_\chi) = \mathbf{M}_i^e(\chi)$ , we will equivalently show that

$$\forall i \geq 0 \mathbf{M}_i^e(\mathbf{L}_\chi) = \mathbf{M}_i^e(\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi).$$

For the base case ( $i = 0$ ) we proceed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_0^e(\mathbf{L}_\chi) &= \mathbf{M}_0^e(\psi) && (df(\chi)) \\ &= \mathbf{M}_0^e(\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi) && ((T. 3) \text{ from Prop. 4.1}). \end{aligned}$$

For the inductive step we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_i^e(\mathbf{L}_\chi) &= \mathbf{M}_{i-1}^e(\circ\mathbf{L}_\chi) \\ &= \mathbf{M}_{i-1}^e(\circ\psi \vee (\circ\varphi \wedge \mathbf{L}_\chi)) && (df(\chi)) \\ &= \max\{\mathbf{M}_i^e(\psi), \min\{\mathbf{M}_i^e(\varphi), \mathbf{M}_{i-1}^e(\mathbf{L}_\chi)\}\} \\ &= \max\{\mathbf{M}_i^e(\psi), \min\{\mathbf{M}_i^e(\varphi), \mathbf{M}_{i-1}^e(\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi)\}\} && (Induction) \\ &= \mathbf{M}_i^e(\psi \vee (\varphi \wedge \Theta(\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi))) && (Equivalence (7)) \\ &= \mathbf{M}_i^e(\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi). \end{aligned}$$

9. The proof for  $\gamma = \varphi\mathcal{T}\psi$  is similar to the proof for  $\gamma = \varphi\mathcal{S}\psi$ .

Finally, we prove the correctness of the translation removing past operators.

**Theorem 4.1 (Main result)** *Let  $\gamma$  in  $\mathcal{L}_V$  be a formula and  $\chi$  one of its subformulas whose form is  $\Theta\varphi$ ,  $\Theta\varphi$ ,  $\varphi\mathcal{S}\psi$  or  $\varphi\mathcal{T}\psi$ . It holds that:*

$$\{\mathbf{M} \mid \mathbf{M} \models \gamma\} = \{\mathbf{M}^e \cap V \mid \mathbf{M}^e \models \gamma_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^X \wedge df(\chi)\}.$$

*Proof.* The ‘ $\subseteq$ ’ inclusion immediately follows from Lemma 4.1. For proving the ‘ $\supseteq$ ’ inclusion, suppose that we have  $\mathbf{M}^e$  such that  $\mathbf{M}^e \models \gamma_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^X \wedge df(\chi)$ . By Lemma 4.2 we conclude that  $\mathbf{M}_0^e(\gamma) = \mathbf{M}_0^e(\gamma_{\mathbf{L}_\chi}^X) = 2$ , so  $\mathbf{M}^e$  is a model of  $\gamma$ . Since  $\gamma$  is a formula in  $\mathcal{L}_V$ , it follows that  $\mathbf{M}^e \cap V \models \gamma$ .

**Corollary 4.1** *Given a past-THT formula  $\gamma$  on  $\mathcal{L}_V$ , every past operator in  $\gamma$  can be removed by introducing auxiliary atoms.  $\square$*

## 5 Conclusions

In this paper we have presented an extension of Temporal Equilibrium Logic (TEL) that introduces past modalities. We have defined the syntax and semantics of this extension and provided a translation that, by introducing auxiliary atoms, allows removing past operators and using back the original version of TEL that only deals with future time connectives.

As future work we will consider the implementation of these operators in the tool STeLP, the axiomatisation of this extension as done in (Balbiani & Diéguez, 2016) and the study of the complexity of the current translation. We also plan to study the potential application as a high-level language for incremental ASP.

**Acknowledgements** We are especially thankful to Luis Fariñas for his support and guidance not only in our work on temporal logic programming, but also in many other research topics related to computational logics. Pedro Cabalar first met Luis at Santiago de Compostela in 1997 attending to Luis’ introductory course on modal logics. That course eventually become the seed of our group’s interest in the topic. Luis combines a deep knowledge and large experience on a wide spectrum of topics in non-classical logics (his literature covers specialized results in modal logics, logic programming, epistemic logics, spatial reasoning, temporal logics, intuitionistic and intermediate logics, conditional logics, and the list goes on!) with a surprising humble and friendly manner that makes him a very sociable person. With his permanently youthful nature, Luis has created a wonderful research group and academic environment in the IRIT at Toulouse, where the members of our group have always been received with open arms, not only at the University but also at his home. This is even more evident in the case of Martín Diéguez who wishes to express his gratitude to Luis and all the members of the LiLAC group for their wonderful reception. Luis, we wish you all the best and we hope we will go on enjoying your company and learning from you for many years!

## References

- Abadi, M., & Manna, Z. (1989). Temporal logic programming. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 8, 277–295.
- Aguado, F., Cabalar, P., Diéguez, M., Pérez, G., & Vidal, C. (2013). Temporal equilibrium logic: a survey. *Journal of Applied Non-Classical Logics*, 2–24.
- Aguado, F., Cabalar, P., Pérez, G., & Vidal, C. (2011). Loop Formulas for Splitable Temporal Logic Programs. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Logic Programming and Nonmonotonic Reasoning (LPNMR 2011)* (Vol. 6645, pp. 80–92). Vancouver, Canada: Springer.
- Balbani, P., & Diéguez, M. (2016). Temporal Here and There. In *Proceedings of the 15th European Conference on Logics in Artificial Intelligence (JELIA 2016)* (Vol. 10021, pp. 81–96). Larnaca, Cyprus: Springer.
- Baudinet, M. (1992). A simple proof of the completeness of temporal logic programming. In L. Fariñas del Cerro & M. Penttonen (Eds.), *Intensional logics for programming* (p. 51-83). Clarendon Press.
- Bozzelli, L., & Pearce, D. (2016). On the expressiveness of temporal equilibrium logic. In *Proceedings of the 15th European Conference on Logics in Artificial Intelligence (JELIA 2016)* (pp. 159–173). Larnaca, Cyprus.
- Cabalar, P. (2015). Stable models for temporal theories - invited talk. In *Proceedings of the 13th international conference on logic programming and non-monotonic reasoning (LPNMR 2015)* (Vol. 9345, p. 1-13). Lexington, KY, USA: Springer.
- Cabalar, P., & Diéguez, M. (2011). STeLP - A Tool for Temporal Answer Set Programming. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on*

- Logic Programming and Nonmonotonic Reasoning (LPNMR 2011)* (Vol. 6645, pp. 370–375). Vancouver, Canada: Springer.
- Cabalar, P., & Diéguez, M. (2014). Strong equivalence of non-monotonic temporal theories. In *Proceedings of the 14th international conference on principles of knowledge representation and reasoning (KR 2014)* (pp. 598–601). Vienna, Austria: AAAI Press.
- Cabalar, P., & Pérez, G. (2007). Temporal equilibrium logic: a first approach. In *Proceedings of the 11th international conference on computer aided systems theory, (EUROCAST'07)* (Vol. 4739, pp. 241–248). Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Spain: Springer.
- Fariñas del Cerro, L. (1986). MOLOG: A system that extends PROLOG with modal logic. *New Generation Computing*, 4(1), 35–50.
- Fariñas del Cerro, L., & Raggio, A. R. (1983). Some results in intuitionistic modal logic. *Logique et Analyse*, 26(102), 219–224.
- Ferraris, P., Lee, J., & Lifschitz, V. (2007). A new perspective on stable models. In *Proceedings of the 20th international joint conference on artificial intelligence (IJCAI 2007)* (pp. 372–379). Hyderabad, India: Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.
- Fischer Servi, G. (1977). On modal logics with an intuitionistic base. *Studia Logica*, 36, 141–149.
- Gabbay, D. M. (1987a). The declarative past and imperative future: Executable temporal logic for interactive systems. In *Proceedings of the 1st conference on temporal logic in specification (TLS'1987)* (Vol. 398, pp. 409–448). Altrincham, UK: Springer-Verlag.
- Gabbay, D. M. (1987b). Modal and temporal logic programming. In A. Galton (Ed.), *Temporal logics and their applications* (pp. 197–237). Academic Press.
- Gabbay, D. M., Pnueli, A., Shelah, S., & Stavi, J. (1980). On the temporal analysis of fairness. In *Proceedings of the 7th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT symposium on principles of programming languages (POPL'80)* (pp. 163–173). New York, USA: ACM.
- Gebser, M., Grote, T., Kaminski, R., Obermeier, P., Sabuncu, O., & Schaub, T. (2012). Stream reasoning with answer set programming: Preliminary report. In *Proceedings of the 13th international conference on principles of knowledge representation and reasoning (KR 2012)* (pp. 613–617). Rome, Italy: AAAI Press.
- Gebser, M., Sabuncu, O., & Schaub, T. (2011). An incremental answer set programming based system for finite model computation. *AI Communications*, 24(2), 195–212.
- Gelfond, M., & Lifschitz, V. (1988). The stable model semantics for logic programming. In R. A. Kowalski & K. A. Bowen (Eds.), *Logic programming: Proceedings of the fifth international conference and symposium (volume 2)* (p. 1070–1080). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Heyting, A. (1930). Die formalen Regeln der intuitionistischen Logik. *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Physikalisch-mathematische Klasse*, 42–56.

- Kamp, J. A. (1968). *Tense logic and the theory of linear order* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California at Los Angeles.
- Marek, V., & Truszczyński, M. (1999). Stable models and an alternative logic programming paradigm. In *The logic programming paradigm: a 25-year perspective* (p. 169-181). Springer-Verlag.
- Markey, N. (2003). Temporal logic with past is exponentially more succinct. *EATCS Bulletin*, 79, 122-128.
- Morgenstern, L. (2014). Representing and reasoning about time travel narratives: Foundational concepts. In *Proceedings of the 14th international conference on principles of knowledge representation and reasoning (KR 2014)* (p. 642-645). Vienna, Austria: AAAI Press.
- Niemelä, I. (1999). Logic programs with stable model semantics as a constraint programming paradigm. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence*, 25, 241-273.
- Nonnengart, A., & Weidenbach, C. (2001). Computing small clause normal forms. In A. Robinson & A. Voronkov (Eds.), *Handbook of automated reasoning* (Vol. 2, pp. 335-367). Elsevier and MIT Press.
- Orgun, M. A., & Ma, W. (1994). An overview of temporal and modal logic programming. In D. M. Gabbay & H. J. Ohlbach (Eds.), *Temporal logic* (Vol. 827, p. 445-479). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Orgun, M. A., & Wadge, W. W. (1992). Theory and practice of temporal logic programming. In L. Fariñas del Cerro & M. Penttonen (Eds.), *Intensional logics for programming* (p. 21-50). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Pearce, D. (1997). A new logical characterisation of stable models and answer sets. In *Selected papers from the non-monotonic extensions of logic programming (NMELP'96)* (Vol. 1216, pp. 57-70). Bad Honnef, Germany: Springer-Verlag.
- Pearce, D., & Valverde, A. (2008). Quantified equilibrium logic and foundations for answer set programs. In *Proceedings of the 24th international conference on logic programming (ICLP 2008)* (Vol. 5366, p. 546-560). Udine, Italy: Springer.
- Pnueli, A. (1977). The temporal logic of programs. In *Proceedings of the 18th annual symposium on foundations of computer science (sfcs'77)* (pp. 46-57). Washington, USA: IEEE Computer Society Press.
- Tseitin, G. S. (1968). On the complexity of derivation in the propositional calculus. *Zapiski nauchnykh seminarov LOMI*, 8, 234-259.