

# Temporal Access to the Iteration Sequences

A unifying approach to fixed point logics

Alexei Lisitsa

Department of Computer Science  
University of Liverpool  
Liverpool, UK  
Email: A.Lisitsa@liverpool.ac.uk

**Abstract**—The semantics of fixed point constructions is commonly defined in terms of iteration sequences. For example, the least fixed point of a monotone operator consists of all points which *eventually* appear in the approximations computed iteratively. We take this temporal reading as the starting point and develop a systematic approach to temporal definitions over iteration sequences. As a result, we propose an extension of first-order predicate logic with an iterative operator, in which iteration steps may be accessed by temporal logic formulae. We show that proposed logic FO+TAI subsumes virtually all known deterministic fixed point extensions of first-order logic as its natural fragments. On the other hand we show that over finite structures FO+TAI has the same expressive power as FO+PFP (FO with partial fixed point operator), but in many cases providing with more concise definitions. Finally, we show that the extension of modal  $\mu$ -calculus with the temporal access leads to the more expressive logic closed under assume-guarantee specifications operator.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The logics with inductive operators (or, fixed point constructs) play an important role in foundations of computer science. Logical languages with fixed point constructs serve as theoretical models of query languages in *database theory* and, when considered over linearly ordered finite structures, can be used to characterize computational complexity classes within *descriptive complexity* theory [24], [14], [15]. The relationships between fixed point logics and complexity have many interesting aspects – the logics reflect faithfully computations over structures and this led to formulation of a new notion of *relational complexity* [4]. On the other hand, tantalizing open problems in computational complexity can be formulated in logical terms, for example  $\text{PTIME} = \text{PSPACE}$  if and only if logics with least fixed point and partial fixed points have the same expressive power over classes of finite models [3]. In other direction, modal logic with fixed points,  $\mu$ -calculus, is one of the unifying formalisms used in the research on model checking and verification [9]. Not necessarily monotone inductive definitions also appear in the research on semantics of logic programming [11], in formalization of reasoning [8] and in the revision theory [19].

In this paper we propose a simple mechanism which “internalizes” the various variants of the inductive definitions within a single logic. Semantics of fixed-point operators is usually defined by using an iteration and in terms of “what the iteration converges to”. For example, the least fixed point of a monotone operator consists of all points which *eventually* appear in the

approximations computed iteratively. We suggest to look on the iteration process itself and augment the logic with an access to the iteration stages via temporal formulae. As a result we get a logic FO+TAI (temporally accessible iteration) which naturally subsumes many (virtually all deterministic variants of) inductive logics, including logics with least fixed point, inflationary fixed point, variants of partial fixed points, as well as logics with anti-monotone and non-monotone inductions.

We present the semantics of FO+TAI for finite structures only. The case of infinite structures requires considering *transfinite iterations* and temporal access to the iteration stages would need a variant of temporal logic over ordinals (e.g. [6]). This case requires further investigations and will be treated elsewhere.

We show that over finite structures FO+TAI is not less expressive than all mentioned inductive logics and at the same time has the same expressive power as FO+PFP. Further, we show that adding the same machinery to the logic of monotone inductions (FO+LFP) does not increase its expressive power. Finally, we show that the extension of the modal  $\mu$ -calculus with the temporal access leads to the more expressive logic closed under assume-guarantee specifications

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section we introduce classical fixed-point logics and first-order temporal logics. Based on that in the Section III we define the logic FO+TAI. In Section IV we demonstrate how to define in FO+TAI classical inductive constructs. In Section V it is shown that FO+TAI subsumes the logic of non-monotone induction FO+ID. In Section VI we consider expressive power of FO+TAI and its monotone fragment. In Section VII we consider the same idea applied to the modal  $\mu$ -calculus. Section VIII concludes the paper.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

### A. Fixed point extensions of first-order logic

We start with a short review of inductive definability, which will set up a context in which logics with temporally accessible iteration naturally appear. In this paper we will mainly deal with definability over (classes of) finite structures, so unless otherwise stated all structures are assumed to be finite.

Let  $\varphi(R, \bar{x})$  be a first-order formula, where  $R$  is a relation symbol of some arity  $k$  and  $\bar{x}$  is a tuple of individual variables of the length  $k$  (the same as the arity of  $R$ ). Consider a structure  $\mathcal{M}$  with the domain  $M$ , interpreting all symbols in

$\varphi$  except  $R$  and  $\bar{x}$ . Then one can consider a map  $\Phi_\varphi : 2^{M^k} \rightarrow 2^{M^k}$ , i.e mapping  $k$ -ary relations over  $M$  to  $k$ -ary relations over  $M$  defined by  $\varphi(R, \bar{x})$  as follows:

$$\Phi_\varphi(P) = \{\bar{a} \mid \mathcal{M} \models \varphi(P, \bar{a})\}$$

Various fixed-point constructions may then be defined. If operator  $\Phi_\varphi$  is monotone then by classical Knaster-Tarski theorem [23] it has a least fixed-point, that is the least relation  $R$ , such that  $R(\bar{x}) \leftrightarrow \varphi(R, \bar{x})$  holds. This least fixed-point  $R^\infty$  can be obtained as a limit of the following iteration:

- $R_0 = \emptyset$
- $R_{i+1} = \Phi(R_i)$

Over finite structures this iteration stabilizes on some finite step  $n \geq 0$ :  $R_{n+1} = R_n$ . A simple syntactical property of  $\varphi(R, \bar{x})$  which guarantees monotonicity of  $\Phi_\varphi$  is that this formula is *positive* in  $R$ .

The *Inflationary fixed point* of a not necessary monotone operator  $\Phi$  is defined as the limit of the following iteration:

- $R_0 = \emptyset$
- $R_{i+1} = \Phi(R_i) \cup R_i$

The inflationary fixed point exists for an arbitrary operator and over finite structures the above iteration reaches it at some finite step.

The *Partial fixed point* of an operator  $\Phi$  defined by an arbitrary formula  $\varphi(R, \bar{x})$  is defined as follows. Consider the iteration:

- $R_0 = \emptyset$
- $R_{i+1} = \Phi(R_i)$

Partial fixed point of  $\Phi$  is a fixed point (limit) of the iteration (if it exists) and the empty set otherwise.

Aiming to resolve difficulties in the definition of semantics of partial fixed point operator over infinite structures in [18] an alternative *general semantics* (PFPgen) for such an operator has been proposed. We will discuss it later in IV-D.

Let IND is one of the above fixed point operators (LFP, IFP, PFP or PFPgen) then the syntax of logic FO+IND extends the standard syntax of first-order logic with the following construct. Let  $\varphi(R, \bar{x})$  be a formula with free individual variables including  $\bar{x} = x_1, \dots, x_k$  and free predicate variable  $R$ . For the case  $\text{IND} \equiv \text{LFP}$  we additionally require that  $\varphi(R, \bar{x})$  is positive in  $R$ . Then  $\rho := [\text{IND}_{R, \bar{x}} \varphi] \bar{t}$  is also formula. Free individual variables of  $\rho$  are free variables occurring in  $\varphi$  and  $\bar{t}$  other than  $\bar{x}$ . Semantics of such formula  $\rho$  is read then as follows: an interpretation of tuple of terms  $\bar{t}$  belongs to the relation which is a fixed point of the operator  $\Phi_\varphi$  of the corresponding type IND (i.e. least, inflationary, partial, or generalized partial fixed point, for  $\text{IND} \equiv \text{LFP}$ , IFP, PFP, PFPgen, respectively.)

Usually the above logics are defined in a way allowing also simultaneous inductive definitions, i.e the formulae of the form  $[\text{IND } R_i : S] \bar{t}$  where

$$S := \begin{cases} R_1(\bar{x}_1) \leftarrow \varphi_1(R_1, \dots, R_k, \bar{x}_1) \\ \vdots \\ R_k(\bar{x}_k) \leftarrow \varphi_k(R_1, \dots, R_k, \bar{x}_k) \end{cases}$$

is a system of formulae. Consider a structure  $\mathcal{M}$  with the domain  $M$ , interpreting all symbols in  $\varphi_i$  except  $R_j$  and  $\bar{x}$ . Then  $\varphi_i$  defines a mapping  $\Phi_{\varphi_i} : 2^{M^{r_1}} \times \dots \times 2^{M^{r_k}} \rightarrow 2^{M^{r_i}}$ , where all  $r_j$  are arities of  $R_j$ , as follows:  $\Phi_{\varphi_i}(P_1, \dots, P_k) = \{\bar{a} \mid \mathcal{M} \models \varphi_i(P_1, \dots, P_k, \bar{a})\}$ . Definitions of all mentioned fixed points naturally generalize to the case of simultaneous iteration

$$R_i^0 = \emptyset$$

$$R_i^{j+1} = \Phi_{\varphi_i}(R_1^j, \dots, R_k^j).$$

The formula  $[\text{IND } R_i : S] \bar{t}$  is true for a tuple of terms  $\bar{t}$  if its interpretation belongs to  $i$ -th component  $R_i^\infty$  of the corresponding simultaneous fixed point. Notice that the semantics of simultaneous PFP is defined componentwise: for the iteration above,  $R_i^\infty = \emptyset$  if  $R_i$  diverges and  $R_j^\infty$  is the limit of  $R_j$  if it exists.

For all mentioned logics, simultaneous induction can be eliminated and equivalent formulae with simple induction can be produced [10], [18].

### B. First-order temporal logic

The language  $\mathcal{TL}$  of first-order temporal logic over the natural numbers is constructed in the standard way from a classical (non-temporal) first-order language  $\mathcal{L}$  and a set of future-time temporal operators ' $\Diamond$ ' (*sometime*), ' $\Box$ ' (*always*), ' $\Diamond^+$ ' (*in the next moment*), ' $\mathcal{U}$ ' (*until*).

Formulae in  $\mathcal{TL}$  are interpreted in *first-order temporal structures* of the form  $\mathfrak{M} = \langle D, \mathcal{I} \rangle$ , where  $D$  is a non-empty set, the *domain* of  $\mathfrak{M}$ , and  $\mathcal{I}$  is a function associating with every moment of time  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  an interpretation of predicate, function and constant symbols of  $\mathcal{L}$  over  $D$ . First-order (nontemporal) structures corresponding to each point of time will be denoted  $\mathfrak{M}_n = \langle D, \mathcal{I}(n) \rangle$ .

Intuitively, the interpretations of  $\mathcal{TL}$ -formulae are sequences of first-order structures, or *states* of  $\mathfrak{M}$ , such as  $\mathfrak{M}_0, \mathfrak{M}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{M}_n, \dots$

An *assignment* in  $D$  is a function  $\alpha$  from the set  $\mathcal{L}_v$  of individual variables of  $\mathcal{L}$  to  $D$ . If  $P$  is a predicate symbol then  $P^{\mathcal{I}(n)}$  (or simply  $P^n$  if  $\mathcal{I}$  is understood) is the interpretation of  $P$  in the state  $\mathfrak{M}_n$ .

We require that (individual) variables and constants of  $\mathcal{TL}$  are *rigid*, that is neither assignments nor interpretations of constants depend on the state in which they are evaluated.

The *satisfaction* relation  $\mathfrak{M}_n \models^\alpha \varphi$  (or simply  $n \models^\alpha \varphi$ , if  $\mathfrak{M}$  is understood) in the structure  $\mathfrak{M}$  for the assignment  $\alpha$  is defined inductively in the usual way under the following semantics of temporal operators:

$$\begin{aligned}
n \models^a \varphi & \text{ iff } n+1 \models^a \varphi \\
n \models^a \Diamond \varphi & \text{ iff there is } m \geq n \text{ such that } m \models^a \varphi \\
n \models^a \Box \varphi & \text{ iff } m \models^a \varphi \text{ for all } m \geq n \\
n \models^a \varphi \mathcal{M} \psi & \text{ iff there is } m \geq n \text{ such that } m \models^a \psi \\
& \text{ and } k \models^a \varphi \text{ for every } n \leq k < m
\end{aligned}$$

Let  $\mathfrak{M}$  be a temporal structure and  $\psi(\bar{x})$  be a temporal formula with  $\bar{x}$  only free variables and  $|\bar{x}| = k$ . Then  $\psi(\bar{x})$  defines a  $k$ -ary relation  $P$  on  $\mathfrak{M}_0$  as follows:  $P(\bar{a}) \leftrightarrow \mathfrak{M}_0 \models^a \psi(\bar{x})$  where  $a : \bar{x} \mapsto \bar{a}$ .

### III. LOGIC WITH TEMPORALLY ACCESSIBLE ITERATION

In all variants of inductive logics we have discussed in the previous section, the semantics of fixed-point construction can be defined in terms of iteration of operators, associated with some formulae. In this section we described a logic which generalizes and subsumes all these logics. The idea is simple: instead of defining a particular fixed-point construct we allow arbitrary iterations of operators defined by formulae. These iterations when evaluated over a structure give rise to the sequences of relations over that structure. Then we allow first-order temporal logic machinery to access these sequences of relations (temporal structures) and define new relations in terms of these sequences.

The syntax of *FO+TAI* (first-order logic with temporally accessible iterations) extends the standard syntax of first-order logic with the following construct. Let  $\varphi(R, \bar{x})$  be a formula with free individual variables  $\bar{x} = x_1, \dots, x_k$  and free predicate variable  $R$  of arity  $k$ . Let  $\psi(\bar{z})$  be a first-order temporal formula ( $\mathcal{TL}$ -formula) with free individual variables  $\bar{z} = z_1, \dots, z_m$ . Then  $\tau := [\psi(\bar{z})][I_{R, \bar{x}}\varphi]\bar{t}$  is also formula, where  $\bar{t}$  is a tuple of terms of the same length as  $\bar{z}$ . The free variables of  $\tau$  are the free variables occurring in  $\bar{t}$  and the free variables of  $\psi$  and  $\varphi$  other than  $\bar{z}$  and  $\bar{x}$ , respectively. The semantics of this construct is defined as follows.

Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a structure with the domain  $M$  and interpretations of all predicate and functional symbols in  $\mathcal{M}$ , which will be denoted by  $P^M$  and  $f^M$ . Let  $a$  be an assignment providing an interpretation of free variables of  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  in  $M$ . Consider the iteration  $R^0 = \emptyset$  and  $R^{i+1} = \Phi_\varphi(R^i)$ . It gives rise to the temporal structure  $\mathfrak{M} = \mathfrak{M}_0, \dots, \mathfrak{M}_i, \dots$ , where every  $\mathfrak{M}_i$  is a structure  $\mathcal{M}$  extended by an interpretation of  $R$  by  $R^i$ . In particular  $\mathfrak{M}_0$  is  $\mathcal{M}$  augmented with the empty interpretation of  $R$ . Let  $P$  is an  $m$ -ary relation defined by  $\psi(\bar{z})$  on  $\mathfrak{M}_0$  (i.e on  $M$ ). Then for any tuple  $\bar{a} \in M^m$ ,  $\mathcal{M} \models [\psi(\bar{z})][I_{R, \bar{x}}\varphi]\bar{a}$  iff  $\bar{a} \in P$ . As in other fixed point logics, we also allow simultaneous iteration formulae, i.e. the formulae of the form  $\tau := [\psi(\bar{z})][I : S]\bar{t}$  where

$$S := \begin{cases} R_1(\bar{x}_1) \leftarrow \varphi_1(R_1, \dots, R_k, \bar{x}_1) \\ \vdots \\ R_k(\bar{x}_k) \leftarrow \varphi_k(R_1, \dots, R_k, \bar{x}_k) \end{cases}$$

is a system of formulae. Simultaneous iteration

$$R_i^0 = \emptyset$$

$$R_i^{j+1} = \Phi_{\varphi_i}(R_1^j, \dots, R_k^j)$$

induces a temporal structure  $\mathfrak{M} = \mathfrak{M}_0, \dots, \mathfrak{M}_i, \dots$ , where every  $\mathfrak{M}_j$  is a structure  $\mathcal{M}$  extended by interpretation of  $R_i$  by  $R_i^j$ . Let  $P$  be an  $m$ -ary relation defined by  $\psi(\bar{z})$  on  $\mathfrak{M}_0$  (i.e on  $M$ ). Then for any tuple  $\bar{a} \in M^m$ ,  $\mathcal{M} \models [\psi(\bar{z})][I : S]\bar{a}$  iff  $\bar{a} \in P$ .

**Proposition 1** *FO+TAI with simultaneous iteration has the same expressive power as FO+TAI with singular iteration.*

**Proof** (hint). The proof proceeds by standard argument based on faithful modelling of simultaneous iteration by a single iteration of higher-dimensional joint operator. Full details of such modelling (for LFP, IFP, PFP) can be found in [10].

### IV. FO+TAI VS OTHER FIXED POINT LOGICS

In this section we show that FO+TAI subsumes many fixed point logics. We start with classical fixed point constructs.

#### A. Least Fixed Point

Translation of LFP construct in FO+TAI follows literally a description of the least fixed point as a limit - least fixed point consists of precisely those tuples which *eventually* appear in approximations:

$$[LFP_{R, \bar{x}}\varphi(R, \bar{x})]\bar{t} := [\Diamond R(\bar{z})][I_{R, \bar{x}}\varphi(R, \bar{x})]\bar{t}$$

Here we assume of course that  $R$  is positive in  $\varphi(R, \bar{x})$ .

#### B. Inflationary Fixed Point

Similarly to the case of LFP we have for Inflationary Fixed Point the following definition:

$$[IFP_{R, \bar{x}}\varphi(R, \bar{x})]\bar{t} := [\Diamond R(\bar{z})][I_{R, \bar{x}}(R(\bar{x}) \vee \varphi(R, \bar{x}))]\bar{t}$$

#### C. Partial Fixed Point

The following definition

$$[PFP_{R, \bar{x}}\varphi(R, \bar{x})]\bar{t} :=$$

$$[\Diamond(R(\bar{z}) \wedge \forall \bar{v}(R(\bar{v}) \Leftrightarrow R(\bar{v})))][I_{R, \bar{x}}\varphi(R, \bar{x})]\bar{t}$$

says that Partial Fixed Point consists of the tuples satisfying two conditions: 1) a tuple should appear at some stage  $i$  of iterations, and furthermore 2) approximations at the stages  $i$  and  $i+1$  should be the same.

#### D. General PFP

In [18] an alternative semantics for PFP has been defined under the name general PFP. Unlike the standard PFP general PFP generalizes easily to infinite structures and having the same expressive power as standard PFP over finite structures provides sometimes with more concise and natural equivalent formulae. As we mentioned in the Introduction, in this paper we consider only semantics over finite structures and for this case definition of general PFP is as follows. Let  $\Phi$  is an operator defined by an arbitrary formula  $\varphi(R, \bar{x})$ . Consider the iteration:

- $R_0 = \emptyset$
- $R_{i+1} = \Phi(R_i)$

Then *general partial fixed point* of  $\Phi$  is defined [18] as a set of tuples which occur at *every stage of the first cycle* in the sequence of stages. As noticed in [18], in general, this definition is not equivalent to saying that the fixed point consists of those tuples which occur at *all stages starting from some stage*. Non-equivalence of two definitions can be established if transfinite iteration is allowed. Since we consider the iteration over finite structures only, a cycle, that is a sequence  $R_i, \dots, R_j$  with  $R_i = R_j$ , will necessarily appear at some *finite stages*  $i$  and  $j$ . Based on that, for the case of finite structures we have the following equivalent definition of PFPgen in terms of FO+TAI:

$$[PFPgen_{R, \bar{x}} \varphi(R, \bar{x})] \bar{t} := [\Diamond \Box R(\bar{z})][I_{R, \bar{x}} \varphi(R, \bar{x})] \bar{t}$$

The definition says that general PFP consists of those tuples which occur at all *finite* stages starting from some stage of iteration.

#### E. Anti-monotone induction

Let  $\Phi_\varphi$  be an operator associated with a formula  $\varphi(P, \bar{x})$ . It may turn out that this operator is *anti-monotone*, that is  $P \subseteq P' \Rightarrow \Phi_\varphi(P') \subseteq \Phi_\varphi(P)$ . Syntactical condition which entails anti-monotonicity is that the predicate variable  $P$  has only negative occurrences in  $\varphi(P, \bar{x})$ . An interesting analogue of classical Knaster-Tarski result holds [27], [11]: for anti-monotone operator  $\Phi$  the iteration  $R_0 = \emptyset$ ,  $R_{i+1} = \Phi(R_i)$  converges to a pair of oscillating points  $P$  and  $Q$  that is  $Q = \Phi(P)$  and  $P = \Phi(Q)$ . What is more, one of the oscillating points is a least fixed point  $\mu$  and another is the greatest fixed point  $\nu$  of the monotone operator  $\Phi^2$  (where  $\Phi^2(X) = \Phi(\Phi(X))$ ).

One may extend then the first-order logic with suitable oscillating points constructs  $[OP_{R, \bar{x}}^\mu \varphi(R, \bar{x})] \bar{t}$  and  $[OP_{R, \bar{x}}^\nu \varphi(R, \bar{x})] \bar{t}$  for  $\varphi(R, \bar{x})$  negative in  $R$ , with obvious semantics. Because of the definability of oscillating points as the fixed points of  $\Phi^2$ , first order logic extended with these constructs is no more expressive than FO+LFP and therefore than FO+TAI. What is interesting here is that FO+TAI allows to define oscillating points directly, not referring to LFP construct. For the greater of two oscillating points we have

$$[OP_{R, \bar{x}}^\nu \varphi(R, \bar{x})] \bar{t} := [\psi^\nu(R)][I_{R, \bar{x}} \varphi(R, \bar{x})] \bar{t}$$

where  $\psi^\nu(R)$  is the temporal formula

$$\Diamond(R(\bar{z}) \wedge \forall \bar{y}(R(\bar{y}) \Leftrightarrow R(\bar{y})) \wedge (\exists \bar{y}(R(\bar{y}) \wedge \neg R(\bar{y})) \vee \forall \bar{y}(R(\bar{y}) \Leftrightarrow R(\bar{y}))))$$

Similarly we have

$$[OP_{R, \bar{x}}^\mu \varphi(R, \bar{x})] \bar{t} := [\psi^\mu(R)][I_{R, \bar{x}} \varphi(R, \bar{x})] \bar{t}$$

where  $\psi^\mu(R)$  is the temporal formula

$$\Diamond(R(\bar{z}) \wedge \forall \bar{y}(R(\bar{y}) \Leftrightarrow R(\bar{y})) \wedge (\exists \bar{y}(\neg R(\bar{y}) \wedge R(\bar{y})) \vee \forall \bar{y}(R(\bar{y}) \Leftrightarrow R(\bar{y}))))$$

#### F. Further variations of FO+TAI definitions

In the above FO+TAI definition for LFP it is assumed that  $\varphi(R, \bar{x})$  is positive in  $R$ . If we consider the same definition  $[\Diamond R(\bar{z})][I_{R, \bar{x}} \varphi(R, \bar{x})] \bar{t}$  for not necessarily positive (and monotone)  $\varphi(R, \bar{x})$  than we get a definition of an operator which does not have direct analogue in standard fixed-point logics and may be considered as a variation of PFP, which we denote by  $PFP^\cup$ . It has turned out though that  $PFP^\cup$  is easily definable by simultaneous PFP, for details see Theorem 1.

If in the definition of PFPgen we swap temporal operators we get a definition of what can be called Recurrent Fixed Point (RFP)<sup>1</sup>:

$$[RFP_{R, \bar{x}} \varphi(R, \bar{x})] \bar{t} := [\Box \Diamond R(\bar{z})][I_{R, \bar{x}} \varphi(R, \bar{x})] \bar{t}$$

Again it is not difficult to demonstrate that RFP is definable in terms of either PFP or PFPgen.

#### V. ID-LOGIC OF NON-MONOTONE INDUCTION

Motivated by well-founded semantics for logic programming in [7] a logic ID of non-monotone definitions has been introduced. Similarly to already discussed fixed point extensions, the syntax of ID-logic (this version<sup>2</sup> we call FO+ID) extends the standard syntax of first-order logic with the following construct. Let  $\varphi(P, \bar{x})$  be a formula with free individual variables  $\bar{x} = x_1, \dots, x_k$  and free predicate variable  $P$ . Then  $\rho := [ID_{P, \bar{x}}(P(\bar{x}) \leftarrow \varphi(P, \bar{x}))] \bar{t}$  is also formula. Now we explain semantics of this construct in terms of FO+TAI, showing thereby that FO+ID is also subsumed by FO+TAI. Since  $\varphi(P, \bar{x})$  may have both negative and positive occurrences of  $P$  the iteration of the operator  $\Psi_\varphi$  applied to the empty interpretation of  $P$  will not necessary converge to a fixed point. In the semantics adopted in FO+ID, the extension of defined predicate is obtained as a *common limit* of iteratively computed lower and upper bounds (if it exists). Introduce two new auxiliary predicate variables  $P_l$  and  $P_u$ , with the intended meaning to be *lower* and *negated upper* approximations for the defined predicate. Further, denote by

<sup>1</sup>Notice, than in general, and similarly to PFPgen, neither of  $PFP^\cup$  or RFP define fixed points of any natural operators. But we follow [18] and retain the name “fixed points” and FP in abbreviations.

<sup>2</sup>In [7] the inductive definitions of ID-logic are presented not by operators, but by special formulae called *definitions*. The difference is purely syntactical and insignificant for our discussion here.

$\varphi(P_l)$ , respectively, by  $\varphi(\neg P_u)$  the result of replacement of all negative occurrences of  $P$  in  $\varphi(P, \bar{x})$  with  $P_l$ , resp. with  $\neg P_u$ . All positive occurrences of  $P$  remains unaffected in both cases. Consider then the following definition of the step of simultaneous iteration:

$$S := \begin{cases} P_u(\bar{y}) \leftarrow \neg[LFP_{P,\bar{x}}(\varphi(P_l))]\bar{y} \\ P_l(\bar{y}) \leftarrow [LFP_{P,\bar{x}}(\varphi(\neg P_u))]\bar{y} \end{cases}$$

Since both  $\varphi(P_l)$  and  $\varphi(\neg P_u)$  are positive in  $P$  the least fixed point operators in the right hand sides of the definitions are well-defined.

Starting with  $P_l^0 = P_u^0 = \emptyset$  and iterating this definition one gets the sequences of lower and *negated* upper approximations  $P_l^i$  and  $P_u^i$ . If the lower and upper approximations converge to the same limit, i.e.  $P_l^\infty = \neg P_u^\infty$  then by definition [7] this limit is taken as the predicate defined by the above ID-construct. Summing up, the FO+ID formula  $\rho$  shown above is equivalent to the following formula of FO+TAI:

$$[\Diamond(P_L(\bar{x}) \wedge \forall \bar{y}(P_l(\bar{y}) \leftrightarrow \neg P_u(\bar{y}))][I : S^*]\bar{t}$$

where  $S^*$  is obtained of the above  $S$  by translation of the right hand side parts of  $S$  into FO+TAI.

## VI. EXPRESSIVE POWER

We have seen in previous sections that FO+TAI is very expressive logic and subsumes many other fixed-point logics, including most expressive (among mentioned) FO+PFP (and FO+PFPgen). The natural question is whether FO+TAI is more expressive than FO+PFP? In this section we answer this question negatively and show that for any formula in FO+TAI one can effectively produce an equivalent (over finite structures) FO+PFP formula.

**Theorem 1** *For every formula  $\tau := [\psi][I_{R,\bar{x}}\varphi]\bar{t}$  of FO+TAI there is an equivalent formula  $\tau^*$  of FO + PFP*

We define a translation of TAI-formula  $\varphi$  to a PFP-formula  $\varphi^*$  satisfying  $\mathcal{M} \models^a \varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi^*$  for all structures  $\mathcal{M}$  and assignments  $a$  to variables.

It is defined by induction on  $\varphi$  construction. If  $\varphi$  is atomic, we define  $\varphi^* = \varphi$ , and we stipulate that the operation  $\cdot^*$  commutes with all first-order connectives and quantifiers. Fix  $\varphi(R, \bar{x})$  and suppose  $\varphi^*$  is defined. For each temporal formula  $\psi$ , we will first define an auxiliary PFP-formula  $\theta_\psi$  with property (1) below, which can easily be used to show that the translation is correct. Given a structure  $\mathcal{M}$  with interpretations for all symbols of  $\varphi$ , including  $R$ , we define  $\mathcal{M}'$  to be the same as  $\mathcal{M}$  except that  $\mathcal{M}' \models R(\bar{a})$  iff  $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(R; \bar{a})$  for each  $\bar{a} \in M^{|\bar{x}|}$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}^*$  be the temporal structure  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}', \mathcal{M}'', \dots)$ . Then for all  $\mathcal{M}$  and all assignments  $a$  of first-order variables into (the domain of)  $\mathcal{M}$ , we will have

$$\mathcal{M} \models^a \theta_\psi \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{M}^*, 0 \models^a \psi \quad (1)$$

First, for simplicity of definitions, we fix a tuple  $\bar{z}$  of distinct variables containing all variables (free and bound) of all  $\psi$

we wish to consider. In general the definition of  $\theta_\psi$  depends (syntactically) on the choice of  $\bar{z}$ , and all variables in  $\bar{z}$  may occur free in  $\theta_\psi$ .

The definition of  $\theta_\psi$  is by induction on  $\psi$ . For atomic  $\psi$  we let  $\theta_\psi = \psi$ , so that  $\mathcal{M} \models^a \theta_\psi$  iff  $\mathcal{M}^*, 0 \models^a \psi$  as required by (1). We stipulate that the map  $\psi \mapsto \theta_\psi$  commutes with all first-order operations. Let  $\psi, \chi$  be given and assume we have defined  $\theta_\psi$ . Then:

- $\theta_{\psi \rightarrow \chi}$  is the result of replacing each subformula  $R(\bar{t})$  in  $\theta_\psi$  by the result of freely substituting  $\bar{t}$  for  $\bar{x}$  in  $\phi^*$  (or by  $\exists \bar{x}(\bar{t} = \bar{x} \wedge \phi^*)$ ).
- $\theta_{\Diamond\psi} = [PFP \ Q\bar{z} : S]$  where

$$S := \begin{cases} A \leftarrow T \\ R'(\bar{x}) \leftarrow [(A \rightarrow (\varphi^*)(R'/R) \wedge (\neg A \rightarrow R(\bar{x})))] \\ Q(\bar{z}) \leftarrow Q(\bar{z}) \vee (A \wedge \theta_\psi(R'/R)) \end{cases}$$

Here,  $(R'/R)$  denotes replacement of the relation symbol  $R$  by a new one,  $R'$ , of the same arity.  $A$  is 0-ary relation symbol representing ‘active’.  $A$  is false initially and true thereafter.

- $\theta_{\psi \wedge \chi} = [PFP \ Q\bar{z} : S]$  where

$$S := \begin{cases} A \leftarrow T \\ R'(\bar{x}) \leftarrow [(A \rightarrow (\varphi^*)(R'/R) \wedge (\neg A \rightarrow R(\bar{x})))] \\ B(\bar{z}) \leftarrow B(\bar{z}) \vee (A \wedge \neg \theta_\psi(R'/R)) \\ Q(\bar{z}) \leftarrow Q(\bar{z}) \vee (\theta_\chi(R'/R) \wedge \neg B(\bar{z})) \end{cases}$$

Now we define  $([\psi][I_{R,\bar{x}}\varphi](\bar{t}))^*$  to be the result of replacing every subformula  $R(\bar{v})$  of  $\theta_\psi(\bar{t}/\bar{z})$  by  $\perp$ .

Correctness of the proposed translation  $\tau \mapsto \tau^*$  is established by induction along the construction. Correctness of the base case and induction steps follows by routine check of definitions.

### A. Temporally accessible monotone induction

What happens if we apply temporal logic based access to the iteration steps of monotone induction? Will the resulting logic be more expressive than the logic of the monotone induction? Negative answer is given by the following theorem.

**Theorem 2** *For every formula  $\tau := [\psi][I_{R,\bar{x}}\varphi]\bar{t}$  of FO+TAI with  $\varphi$  positive in  $R$  there is an equivalent formula  $(\tau)^*$  of FO + LFP*

**Proof.** The translation here uses the *stage comparison theorem* of Moschovakis [21]. With any monotone map  $\Phi_\varphi$  of arity  $k$  defined by a positive in  $R$  formula and a structure with finite domain  $M$  one can associate a rank function  $|\cdot|_\Phi : M^k \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  which when applied to any tuple of elements  $\bar{a} \in M^k$  yields the least number  $n$  such that  $\bar{a} \in \Phi^n(\emptyset)$  if such  $n$  exists and  $\infty$  otherwise, i.e. when  $\bar{a} \notin \Phi_\varphi^\infty(\emptyset)$

Stage comparison relation  $\leq_\Phi$  defined as  $\bar{a} \leq_\Phi \bar{b} \Leftrightarrow \bar{a}, \bar{b} \in \Phi_\varphi^\infty(\emptyset)$  and  $|\bar{a}| \leq |\bar{b}|$ .

**Theorem 3 (stage comparison [21])** *For any LFP $_\varphi$  operator associated with a first-order formula  $\varphi(P, \bar{x})$  positive in*

$P$  the stage comparison relation  $\leq_\varphi$  is definable in FO+LFP uniformly over all finite structures.

The stage comparison relation can be used then to simulate time in modelling temporal access to the iteration steps within FO+LFP. As above, the translation is defined by induction on formula structure. We present here only the translation of  $[\psi(\bar{z})][I_{R,\bar{x}\varphi}]\bar{t}$  where  $\psi(\bar{z})$  is a temporal formula and  $\varphi$  is in FO+LFP.

For a formula  $[\psi(\bar{z})][I_{R,\bar{x}\varphi}]\bar{t}$ , define the translation of its temporal header  $\psi(\bar{z})$  in the *context of iteration*  $[I_{R,\bar{x}\varphi}]$ , to a formula in FO+LFP. The translation is indexed by either a constant  $s$  (from *start*) or a tuple of variables of the same length as the arity of the predicate used in iteration definition, i.e. of  $R$ . Intuitively,  $[\cdot]^s$  and  $[\cdot]^{\bar{u}}$  denote interpretations at the 0th stage of iteration and at the stage  $|\bar{u}|_\varphi$ , respectively.

- $[R(\bar{x})]^s := \perp$  (for the iteration predicate  $R$ )
- $[P(\bar{x})]^s := P(\bar{x})$  (for any predicate  $P$  other than iteration predicate).
- $[R(\bar{x})]^{\bar{u}} := \bar{x} \leq_\varphi \bar{u} \wedge R(\bar{x})$  (for the iteration predicate  $R$ )
- $[P(\bar{x})]^{\bar{u}} := P(\bar{x})$  (for any predicate  $P$  other than iteration predicate)
- $[\rho \wedge \tau]^s := [\rho]^s \wedge [\tau]^s$
- $[\rho \wedge \tau]^{\bar{u}} := [\rho]^{\bar{u}} \wedge [\tau]^{\bar{u}}$
- $[\neg \rho]^s := \neg [\rho]^s$
- $[\neg \rho]^{\bar{u}} := \neg [\rho]^{\bar{u}}$
- $[\forall x \rho]^s := \forall x [\rho]^s$
- $[\forall x \rho]^{\bar{u}} := \forall x [\rho]^{\bar{u}}$
- $[\tau]^s := \exists \bar{u} (\varphi(\bar{u}) \wedge [\tau]^{\bar{u}})$
- $[\tau]^{\bar{u}} := \exists \bar{u}' (\text{next}_\varphi(\bar{u}, \bar{u}') \wedge [\tau]^{\bar{u}'})$
- $[\Diamond \tau]^s := \exists \bar{u} [LFP_{R,\bar{x}\varphi} \bar{u} \wedge [\tau]^{\bar{u}}]$
- $[\Diamond \tau]^{\bar{u}} := \exists \bar{u}' ((\bar{u} \leq_\varphi \bar{u}') \wedge [\tau]^{\bar{u}'})$
- $[\rho \mathcal{M} \tau]^s := \exists \bar{u} ([LFP_{R,\bar{x}\varphi} \bar{u} \wedge [\tau]^{\bar{u}}] \wedge \forall \bar{u}' (\bar{u}' <_\varphi \bar{u}) \rightarrow [\rho]^{\bar{u}'})$
- $[\rho \mathcal{M} \tau]^{\bar{u}} := \exists \bar{u}' (\bar{u} \leq_\varphi \bar{u}' \wedge [\tau]^{\bar{u}'}) \wedge \forall \bar{u}'' (\bar{u} \leq_\varphi \bar{u}'' <_\varphi \bar{u}') \rightarrow [\rho]^{\bar{u}''})$

In the definition of  $[\tau]^{\bar{u}}$  above, the expression  $\text{next}_\varphi(\bar{u}, \bar{u}')$  denotes a LFP formula defining the relation *next* with respect to linear order  $\leq_\varphi$ .

Now to get a formula in FO+LFP equivalent to  $[\psi(\bar{z})][I_{R,\bar{x}\varphi}]\bar{t}$  we take the translation  $[\psi(\bar{z})]^s$  in the context of  $[I_{R,\bar{x}\varphi}]\bar{t}$ .

Correctness of the proposed translation  $\tau \mapsto \tau^*$  is established by induction along the construction. Correctness of the base case and induction steps follows by routine check of definitions.

## VII. MODAL $\mu$ -CALCULUS WITH TEMPORAL ACCESS

Modal  $\mu$ -calculus [16] is an extension of a basic propositional modal logic with the monotone fixed points. It is an expressive logic subsuming many other propositional temporal logics and it is one of the unifying formalisms used in the research on model checking and verification. As it was shown in [26] the  $\mu$ -calculus is *not closed* under construction of the assume-guarantee specifications which are

central in assumption-guarantee paradigm [20], [22], [2], [12], [25] for compositional or hierarchical verification. Within this paradigm a component of a system is specified in terms of assumptions about its environment and properties it guaranteed about its behaviour, provided the assumptions hold. Reasoning about such specifications uses a kind of circular compositional rule and [25] provides with a unifying framework in which assume-guarantee semantics was given for properties expressible as fixed points. In [26] higher-order modal fixed point logic was proposed which allows to define assume-guarantee specifications for modal fixed points.

We show here that there is an alternative way to fix  $\mu$ -calculus, that is by adding the temporal access to it. It makes an extended  $\mu$ -calculus more expressive and closed under assume-guarantee specifications.

Extend the standard syntax of  $\mu$ -calculus by the following construct  $[\psi][I : R]$  where  $\psi$  is a *propositional* linear time temporal formula and

$$R := \begin{cases} P_1 \leftarrow \varphi_1(P_1, \dots, P_k) \\ \vdots \\ P_k \leftarrow \varphi_k(P_1, \dots, P_k) \end{cases}$$

where  $P_1, \dots, P_k$  have only positive occurrences in  $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k$ .

For a transition system with a set of states  $S$  the iteration of the monotone operator  $F_R$  associated with the above  $R$  gives rise to the sequence  $\bar{P}^0 = \emptyset$  and  $\bar{P}^{i+1} = F_R(\bar{P}^i)$ . For every state  $s \in S$  this sequence induces a propositional temporal model  $M(s)$  by letting  $M(s)_n \models P_j$  iff  $s \in P_j^n$ . Define now the semantics of  $[\psi][I : R]$  to be the set of all points in  $S$  whose associated temporal models satisfy  $\psi$ , i.e.  $\{s \in S \mid M(s) \models \psi\}$ . We call such a defined extension  $\mu$ +TAI.

### Definition 1 (assume-guaranteed specifications [26])

For monotonic functions  $A, G : 2^S \rightarrow 2^S$ , the *assume-guarantee property*  $\nu X.A(X) \triangleright \nu X.G(X) \in 2^S$  is defined as  $s \in \nu X.A(X) \triangleright \nu X.G(X)$  iff  $\forall k \geq 0. s \in [\nu X.A(X)]^k \Rightarrow s \in [\nu X.G(X)]^{k+1}$ .

**Proposition 2** For all  $\mu$ +TAI formulae  $\varphi(X)$  and  $\psi(Y)$  positive in  $X$  and  $Y$ , assume-guarantee property  $\varphi(X) \triangleright \psi(Y)$  is definable in  $\mu$ +TAI.

**Proof.** Let  $\varphi(X) \triangleright \psi(Y) \equiv [\Box(X \rightarrow Y)][X \leftarrow \varphi(X); Y \leftarrow \psi(Y)]$ .

**Corollary 1**  $\mu$ +TAI is more expressive than  $\mu$ -calculus.

## VIII. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We proposed in this paper the logic with temporally accessible iteration which provides the simple unifying framework for studying logics with inductive fixed point operators. Obvious next step is to extend the semantics to the case of infinite structures. Also of interest are modifications of FO+TAI with branching time access to incorporate non-deterministic inductive definitions [5]. Further analysis of the modal variants,

including the logics with not necessarily monotone inductive definitions and comparisons with MIC (modal iteration calculus) and MPC (modal partial iteration calculus) [17] are required. Finally notice that FO+TAI and its variants may find applications in formal analysis of revision theory in the spirit of proposition from [19] to analyse “the nonmonotonic process by looking at the behaviour of interpretations under revision rules”.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Author would like to thank anonymous referees for their helpful suggestions.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] P. Aczel. An introduction to inductive definitions. In *Handbook on Mathematical Logic*, J. Barwise, ed., North-Holland Publishing Company, 1977.
- [2] M. Abadi, L. Lamport, Composing Specifications. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems* 17 (1995) 507-534.
- [3] S. Abiteboul and V. Vianu. Computing with first-order logic. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 50, 1995, pp 309-335.
- [4] S. Abiteboul, M. Vardi, V. Vianu, Fixpoint logics, relational machines, and computational complexity. *Journal of ACM*, v.44, January 1997, pp 30-56.
- [5] A. Dawar and Y. Gurevich, Fixed-point logics. *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic*, 8(1):65-88, 2002.
- [6] S. Demri and D. Nowak. Reasoning about transfinite sequences. *International Journal of Foundations of Computer Science*, 18(1), pp 87-112, 2007.
- [7] M. Denecker, and E. Ternovska, A Logic of Non-Monotone Inductive Definitions, *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic*, Vol. 9, No. 2, Article 14, 2008.
- [8] M. Denecker, and E. Ternovska, Inductive Situation Calculus, *Artificial Intelligence* 171 (5-6), pp. 332-360, April, 2007.
- [9] E. Allen Emerson, Model Checking and the Mu-calculus. *Descriptive Complexity and Finite Models*: 185-214, American Mathematical Society, 1996
- [10] H.-D. Ebbinghaus, J. Flum, *Finite Model Theory*, 2nd Edition, Springer, 1999
- [11] M. Fitting, Fixpoint semantics for logic programming – a survey. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 278, pp 25–31, 2002.
- [12] T.A. Henzinger, S. Qadeer, S.K. Rajamani, S. Tasiran, An assume-guarantee rule for checking simulation. In G. Gopalakrishnan, P. Windley, eds. *FMCAD 98: Formal Methods in Computer-aided Design*, vol 1522 of LNCS, Springer-Verlag 91998) 421–432
- [13] D.M. Gabbay, M.A. Reynolds, M. Finger. Temporal Logic. *Mathematical Foundations and Computational Aspects*, Volume 2, Oxford Science Publications, Clarendon Press, 2000.
- [14] N. Immerman. Relational queries computable in polynomial time. *Information and Control*, 68, pp 86–104, 1986
- [15] N. Immerman. *Descriptive Complexity*, Springer-Verlag, 1999.
- [16] D. Kozen, Results on the propositional  $\mu$ -calculus. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 27, pp 333-354, 1983.
- [17] S. Kreutzer, Pure and Applied Fixed-Point Logics, dissertation thesis, RWTH Aachen, 2002.
- [18] S. Kreutzer, Partial Fixed-Point Logic on Infinite Structures, *Proceedings of CSL 2002*, pp 337-351, 2002.
- [19] B. Löwe, Revision Forever! in *Conceptual Structures: Inspiration and Application*, LNCS 4068, pp 22-36, 2006.
- [20] J. Misra, K.M. Chandy, Proofs of network processes. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* SE-7 (1981) 417–226
- [21] Y.N. Moschovakis. Elementary Induction on Abstract Structures, North Holland, 1974.
- [22] A. Pnueli, In transition from global to modular temporal reasoning about programs. In: *Logics and Models of Concurrent Systems*. Nato ASI Series. Springer-Verlag (1984) 123-144
- [23] A. Tarski, Lattice-theoretical fixpoint theorem and its applications. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 5, 285–309, 1955
- [24] M. Vardi, The complexity of relational query languages. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing*, 1982, pp 137-146.
- [25] M. Viswanathan and R. Viswanathan, Foundations of Circular Compositional Reasoning,. In *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming*. LNCS 2076, Springer-Verlag, 2001, pp 835-847.
- [26] M. Viswanathan and R. Viswanathan, A Higher Order Modal Fixed Point Logic, in P. Gardner and N. Yoshida (Eds.): *CONCUR 2004*, LNCS 3170, pp 512-528, 2004.
- [27] S.Yablo. Truth and reflection. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 14: 297–349, 1985.