

Horn Fragments of the Halpern-Shoham Interval Temporal Logic (Technical Report)

D. Bresolin¹, A. Kurucz², E. Muñoz-Velasco³, V. Ryzhikov⁴, G. Sciavicco⁵,
and M. Zakharyashev⁶

¹University of Bologna, Italy (davide.bresolin@unibo.it)

²King's College London, U.K. (agi.kurucz@kcl.ac.uk)

³University of Malaga, Spain (emilio@ctima.uma.es)

⁴Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, Italy (ryzhikov@inf.unibz.it)

⁵University of Ferrara, Italy (guido.sciavicco@unife.it)

⁶Birkbeck, University of London, U.K. (michael@dcs.bbk.ac.uk)

Abstract

We investigate the satisfiability problem for Horn fragments of the Halpern-Shoham interval temporal logic depending on the type (box or diamond) of the interval modal operators, the type of the underlying linear order (discrete or dense), and the type of semantics for the interval relations (reflexive or irreflexive). For example, we show that satisfiability of Horn formulas with diamonds is undecidable for any type of linear orders and semantics. On the contrary, satisfiability of Horn formulas with boxes is tractable over both discrete and dense orders under the reflexive semantics and over dense orders under the irreflexive semantics, but becomes undecidable over discrete orders under the irreflexive semantics. Satisfiability of binary Horn formulas with both boxes and diamonds is always undecidable under the irreflexive semantics.

1 Introduction

Our concern in this paper is the satisfiability problem for Horn fragments of the interval temporal (or modal) logic introduced by Halpern and Shoham [27] and known since then under the moniker \mathcal{HS} . Syntactically, \mathcal{HS} is a classical propositional logic with modal diamond operators of the form $\langle R \rangle$, where R is one of Allen's [1] twelve interval relations: *After*, *Begins*, *Ends*, *During*, *Later*, *Overlaps* and their inverses. The propositional variables of \mathcal{HS} are interpreted by sets of closed intervals $[i, j]$ of some flow of time (such as \mathbb{Z} , \mathbb{R} , etc.), and a formula $\langle R \rangle \varphi$ is regarded to be true in $[i, j]$ if and only if φ is true in some interval $[i', j']$ such that $[i, j]R[i', j']$ in Allen's interval algebra.

The elegance and expressive power of \mathcal{HS} have attracted attention of the temporal and modal communities, as well as many other areas of computer science, AI, philosophy and linguistics; e.g., [2, 14, 16, 19, 21, 41]. However, promising applications have been hampered by the fact, already discovered by Halpern and Shoham [27], that \mathcal{HS} is highly undecidable (for example, validity over \mathbb{Z} and \mathbb{R} is Π_1^1 -hard).

A quest for 'tame' fragments of \mathcal{HS} began in the 2000s, and has resulted in a substantial body of literature that identified a number of ways of reducing the expressive power of \mathcal{HS} :

- *Constraining the underlying temporal structures.* Montanari et al. [37] interpreted their Split Logic \mathcal{SL} over structures where every interval can be chopped into at most a constant number of subintervals. \mathcal{SL} shares the syntax with \mathcal{HS} and \mathcal{CDT} [47, 28] and can be seen as their decidable variant.
- *Restricting the set of modal operators.* Complete classifications of decidable and undecidable fragments of \mathcal{HS} have been obtained for finite linear orders (62 decidable fragments), discrete linear orders (44), \mathbb{N} (47), \mathbb{Z} (44), and dense linear orders (130). For example, over finite linear orders, there

are two maximal decidable fragments with the relations A, \bar{A}, B, \bar{B} and A, \bar{A}, E, \bar{E} , both of which are non-primitive recursive. Smaller fragments may have lower complexity: for example, the B, \bar{B}, L, \bar{L} fragment is NP-complete, A, \bar{A} is NEXPTIME-complete, while A, B, \bar{B}, \bar{L} is EXPSPACE-complete. For more details, we refer the reader to [36, 9, 10, 11] and references therein.

- *Softening semantics.* Allen [1] and Halpern and Shoham [27] defined the semantics of interval relations using the irreflexive $<$: for example, $[x, y] \ll [x', y']$ if and only if $y < x'$. By ‘softening’ $<$ to reflexive \leq one can make the undecidable D fragment of \mathcal{HS} [33] decidable and PSPACE-complete [35].
- *Relativisations.* The results of Schwentick and Zeume [43] imply that some undecidable fragments of \mathcal{HS} become decidable if one allows models in which not all the possible intervals of the underlying linear order are present.
- *Restricting the nesting of modal operators.* Bresolin et al. [12] defined a decidable fragment of \mathcal{CDT} that mimics the behaviour of the (NP-complete) Bernays-Schöenfinkel fragment of first-order logic, and one can define a similar fragment of \mathcal{HS} .
- *Coarsening relations.* Inspired by Golumbic and Shamir’s [25] coarser interval algebra, Muñoz-Velasco et al. [39] reduce the expressive power of \mathcal{HS} by defining interval relations that correspond to (relational) unions of Allen’s relations. They proposed two coarsening schemata, one of which turned out to be PSPACE-complete.

In this article, we analyse a different way of taming the expressive power of logic formalisms while retaining their usefulness for applications, viz., taking Horn fragments. Universal first-order Horn sentences $\forall \mathbf{x}(A_1 \wedge \dots \wedge A_n \rightarrow A_0)$ with atomic A_i are rules (or clauses) of the programming language Prolog. Although Prolog itself is undecidable due to the availability of functional symbols, its function-free subset Datalog, designed for interacting with databases, is EXPTIME-complete for combined complexity, even PSPACE-complete when restricted to predicates of bounded arity, and P-complete in the propositional case [20]. Horn fragments of the Web Ontology Language *OWL 2* [48] such as the tractable profiles *OWL 2 QL* and *OWL 2 EL* were designed for ontology-based data access via query rewriting and applications that require ontologies with very large numbers of properties and classes (e.g., SNOMED CT). More expressive decidable Horn knowledge representation formalisms have been designed in Description Logic [29, 30], in particular, temporal description logics; see [32, 5] and references therein. Horn fragments of modal and temporal logics have also been considered [22, 18, 17, 40, 4].

In the context of the Halpern-Shoham logic, we observe first that any \mathcal{HS} -formula can be transformed to an equisatisfiable formula in *clausal normal form*:

$$\varphi ::= \lambda \mid \neg\lambda \mid [\mathbf{U}](\neg\lambda_1 \vee \dots \vee \neg\lambda_n \vee \lambda_{n+1} \vee \dots \vee \lambda_{n+m}) \mid \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2, \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{U} is the *universal relation* (which can be expressed via the interval relations as $[\mathbf{U}]\psi = \bigwedge_{\mathbf{R}}(\psi \wedge [\mathbf{R}]\psi \wedge [\bar{\mathbf{R}}]\psi)$), and λ and the λ_i are (*positive temporal*) *literals* given by

$$\lambda ::= \top \mid \perp \mid p \mid \langle \mathbf{R} \rangle \lambda \mid [\mathbf{R}]\lambda, \quad (2)$$

with \mathbf{R} being one of the interval relations and p a *propositional variable*. We now define the *Horn fragment* \mathcal{HS}_{horn} of \mathcal{HS} as comprising the formulas given by the grammar

$$\varphi ::= \lambda \mid [\mathbf{U}](\lambda_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \lambda_k \rightarrow \lambda) \mid \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2. \quad (3)$$

The conjuncts of the form λ are called the *initial conditions* of φ , and those of the form $[\mathbf{U}](\lambda_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \lambda_k \rightarrow \lambda)$ the *clauses* of φ . We also consider the $\mathcal{HS}_{horn}^{\square}$ fragment of \mathcal{HS}_{horn} , whose formulas do not contain occurrences of diamond operators $\langle \mathbf{R} \rangle$, and the $\mathcal{HS}_{horn}^{\diamond}$ fragment whose formulas do not contain box operators $[\mathbf{R}]$. We denote by \mathcal{HS}_{core} ($\mathcal{HS}_{core}^{\square}$ or $\mathcal{HS}_{core}^{\diamond}$) the fragment of \mathcal{HS}_{horn} (respectively, $\mathcal{HS}_{horn}^{\square}$ or $\mathcal{HS}_{horn}^{\diamond}$) with only clauses of the form $[\mathbf{U}](\lambda_1 \rightarrow \lambda_2)$ and $[\mathbf{U}](\lambda_1 \wedge \lambda_2 \rightarrow \perp)$. We remind the reader that propositional Horn logic is P-complete, while the (core) logic of binary Horn clauses is NLOGSPACE-complete.

Table 1: Horn and core \mathcal{HS} -satisfiability over various linear orders.

	Irreflexive semantics	Reflexive semantics
\mathcal{HS}_{horn}	undecidable* (Thm. 9)	
\mathcal{HS}_{core}	undecidable* (Thm. 10)	PSPACE-hard* (Thm. 7) decidable?
$\mathcal{HS}_{horn}^{\diamond}$	undecidable* (Thm. 9)	
$\mathcal{HS}_{core}^{\diamond}$	decidable?	
$\mathcal{HS}_{horn}^{\square}$	discrete: undecidable (Thm. 11) dense: P-complete (Thm. 4)	P-complete (Thm. 4)
$\mathcal{HS}_{core}^{\square}$	discrete: PSPACE-hard (Thm. 8) decidable? dense: in P (Thm. 4)	in P (Thm. 4)

*actually holds for any class of linear orders containing an infinite order.

We illustrate the expressive power of the Horn fragments introduced above by a few examples describing constraints on a summer school timetable. The clause

$$[U](\langle \bar{D} \rangle \text{MorningSession} \wedge \text{AdvancedCourse} \rightarrow \perp)$$

says that advanced courses cannot be given during the morning sessions defined by

$$[U](\langle \bar{B} \rangle \text{LectureDay} \wedge \langle A \rangle \text{Lunch} \leftrightarrow \text{MorningSession}).$$

The clause

$$[U](\text{teaches} \rightarrow [D]\text{teaches})$$

claims that *teaches* is *downward hereditary* (or *stative*) in the sense that if it holds in some interval, then it also holds in all of its sub-intervals. If, instead, we want to state that *teaches* is *upward hereditary* (or *coalesced*) in the sense that *teaches* holds in any interval covered by sub-intervals where it holds, then we can use the clause

$$[U]([D](\langle O \rangle \text{teaches} \vee \langle \bar{D} \rangle \text{teaches}) \wedge \langle B \rangle \text{teaches} \wedge \langle E \rangle \text{teaches} \rightarrow \text{teaches}).$$

By removing the last two conjuncts on the left-hand side of this clause, we make sure that *teaches* is both upward and downward hereditary. For a discussion of these notions in temporal databases, consult [7, 45]. Note also that all of the above example clauses—apart from the implication \leftarrow in the second one—are equisatisfiable to $\mathcal{HS}_{horn}^{\square}$ -formulas (see Section 2 for details).

Our contribution In this article, we investigate the satisfiability problem for the Horn fragments of \mathcal{HS} along two main axes. We consider:

- both the standard ‘irreflexive’ semantics for \mathcal{HS} -formulas given by Halpern and Shoham [27] and its reflexive variant
- over classes of discrete and dense linear orders (such as (\mathbb{Z}, \leq) and (\mathbb{R}, \leq)).

The obtained results are summarised in Table 1. Most surprising is the computational behaviour of $\mathcal{HS}_{horn}^\square$, which turns out to be undecidable over discrete orders under the irreflexive semantics (Theorem 11), but becomes tractable under all other choices of semantics (Theorem 4). The tractability results, coupled with the ability of $\mathcal{HS}_{horn}^\square$ -formulas to express interesting temporal constraints, suggests that $\mathcal{HS}_{horn}^\square$ can form a basis for tractable interval temporal ontology languages that can be used for ontology-based data access over temporal databases or streamed data. Some preliminary steps in this direction have been made by Artale et al. [6].

On the other hand, the undecidability of $\mathcal{HS}_{horn}^\square$ over discrete orders with the irreflexive semantics prompted us to investigate possible sources of high complexity.

- What is the crucial difference between irreflexive discrete and other semantic choices? In irreflexive models one can single out punctual intervals (with coincident endpoints) with a very simple ($\mathcal{HS}_{core}^\square$) formula $[R]_\perp$, where R can be any of E, B, D . Looking at \mathcal{HS} -models from the 2D perspective as in Fig. 1, we can see that punctual intervals form a *diagonal*. If in addition the underlying linear order is discrete, then such a unique diagonal might provide us with some kind of ‘horizontal’ and ‘vertical’ counting capabilities along the 2D grid, even if horizontal and vertical ‘next-time operators’ are not available in the \mathcal{HS} -language directly. It is well-investigated in 2D *modal product logics* that if such a ‘unique controllable diagonal’ is expressible in a logic, then high complexity of its satisfiability problem follows [23]. It turns out that in $\mathcal{HS}_{horn}^\square$ sufficient counting can be expressed to show undecidability (Theorem 11), while the seemingly very limited expressive power of $\mathcal{HS}_{core}^\square$ is still enough to prove PSPACE-hardness (Theorem 8).
- When \diamond -operators are available, even if the models are reflexive and/or dense, one can generate a unique sequence of ‘diagonal-squares’ (like on a chessboard) and perform some horizontal and vertical counting on it. In particular, bimodal logics over products of (reflexive/irreflexive) linear orders [34, 42] and also over products of various transitive (not necessarily linear) relations [24] are all shown to be undecidable in this way. It follows that full Boolean \mathcal{HS} -satisfiability with the reflexive semantics over any unbounded timelines is undecidable. Here we generalise this methodology and show that undecidability still holds even within the $\mathcal{HS}_{horn}^\diamond$ -fragment (Theorem 9).
- We also analyse to what extent the above techniques can be applied within *core* fragments having \diamond -operators. We develop some ‘tricks’ that encode a certain degree of ‘Horn-ness’ to prove intractable lower bounds for \mathcal{HS}_{core} -satisfiability: undecidability with the irreflexive semantics (Theorem 10) and PSPACE-hardness with the reflexive one (Theorem 7).

The undecidability of \mathcal{HS}_{horn} under the irreflexive semantics was established in the conference paper [13], and the tractability of $\mathcal{HS}_{horn}^\square$ over (\mathbb{Z}, \leq) under the reflexive semantics in [6].

2 Semantics and notation

\mathcal{HS} -formulas are interpreted over the set of intervals of any linear order¹ $\mathfrak{T} = (T, \leq)$ (where \leq is a reflexive, transitive, antisymmetric and connected binary relation on T). As usual, we use $x < y$ as a shortcut for ‘ $x \leq y$ and $x \neq y$ ’. The linear order \mathfrak{T} is

- *dense* if, for any $x, y \in T$ with $x < y$, there exists z such that $x < z < y$;
- *discrete* if every non-maximal $x \in T$ has an immediate $<$ -successor, and every non-minimal $x \in T$ has an immediate $<$ -predecessor.

¹Originally, Halpern and Shoham [27] also considered more complex temporal structures based on partial orders with *linear intervals* such that, whenever $x \leq y$, then the closed interval $\{z \in T \mid x \leq z \leq y\}$ is linearly ordered by \leq . In particular, trees are temporal structures in this sense.

Thus, the rationals (\mathbb{Q}, \leq) and reals (\mathbb{R}, \leq) are dense orders, while the integers (\mathbb{Z}, \leq) and the natural numbers (\mathbb{N}, \leq) are discrete. Any finite linear order is obviously discrete. We denote by Lin the class of all linear orders, by Fin the class of all finite linear orders, by Dis the class of all discrete linear orders, and by Den the class of all dense linear orders. We say that a linear order *contains an infinite ascending (descending) chain* if it has a sequence of points $x_n, n < \omega$, such that $x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_n < \dots$ (respectively, $x_0 > x_1 > \dots > x_n > \dots$). Clearly, any infinite linear order contains an infinite ascending or an infinite descending chain.

Following Halpern and Shoham [27], by an *interval in \mathfrak{T}* we mean any ordered pair $\langle x, y \rangle$ such that $x \leq y$, and denote by $\text{int}(\mathfrak{T})$ the set of all intervals in \mathfrak{T} . Note that $\text{int}(\mathfrak{T})$ contains all the *punctual intervals* of the form $\langle x, x \rangle$, which is often referred to as the *non-strict semantics*. Under the *strict semantics* adopted by Allen [1], punctual intervals are disallowed. Most of our results hold for both semantics, and we shall comment on the cases where the strict semantics requires a special treatment. We define the interval relations over $\text{int}(\mathfrak{T})$ in the same way as Halpern and Shoham [27] by taking (see Fig. 1):

- $\langle x_1, y_1 \rangle \text{A} \langle x_2, y_2 \rangle$ iff $y_1 = x_2$ and $x_2 < y_2$, (After)
- $\langle x_1, y_1 \rangle \text{B} \langle x_2, y_2 \rangle$ iff $x_1 = x_2$ and $y_2 < y_1$, (Begins)
- $\langle x_1, y_1 \rangle \text{E} \langle x_2, y_2 \rangle$ iff $x_1 < x_2$ and $y_1 = y_2$, (Ends)
- $\langle x_1, y_1 \rangle \text{D} \langle x_2, y_2 \rangle$ iff $x_1 < x_2$ and $y_2 < y_1$, (During)
- $\langle x_1, y_1 \rangle \text{L} \langle x_2, y_2 \rangle$ iff $y_1 < x_2$, (Later)
- $\langle x_1, y_1 \rangle \text{O} \langle x_2, y_2 \rangle$ iff $x_1 < x_2 < y_1 < y_2$, (Overlaps)

and denote by $\bar{\text{A}}, \bar{\text{B}}, \bar{\text{E}}, \bar{\text{D}}, \bar{\text{L}}, \bar{\text{O}}$ the inverses of A, B, E, D, L, O, respectively. Observe that all of these relations are irreflexive, so we refer to the definition above as the *irreflexive semantics*. As an alternative, we also consider the *reflexive semantics*, which is obtained by replacing each $<$ with \leq . We write $\mathfrak{T}(\leq)$ or $\mathfrak{T}(<)$ to indicate that the semantics is reflexive or, respectively, irreflexive. When formulating results where the choice of semantics for each interval relation does not matter, we use the term *arbitrary semantics*.²

As observed by Venema [46], if we represent intervals $\langle x, y \rangle \in \text{int}(\mathfrak{T})$ by points (x, y) of the ‘north-western’ subset of the two-dimensional Cartesian product $T \times T$, then $\text{int}(\mathfrak{T})$ together with the interval relations (under any semantics) forms a multimodal Kripke frame (see Fig. 1). We denote it by $\mathfrak{F}_{\mathfrak{T}}$ and call an *HS-frame*.³ Given a linear order \mathfrak{T} , an *HS-model based on \mathfrak{T}* is a pair $\mathfrak{M} = (\mathfrak{F}_{\mathfrak{T}}, \nu)$, where $\mathfrak{F}_{\mathfrak{T}}$ is an HS-frame and ν a function from the set \mathcal{P} of propositional variables to subsets of $\text{int}(\mathfrak{T})$. The *truth-relation* $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models \varphi$, for an *HS_{horn}-formula* φ , is defined inductively as follows, where R is any interval relation:

- $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models \top$ and $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \not\models \perp$, for any $\langle x, y \rangle \in \text{int}(\mathfrak{T})$;
- $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models p$ iff $\langle x, y \rangle \in \nu(p)$, for any $p \in \mathcal{P}$;
- $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models \langle \text{R} \rangle \lambda$ iff there exists $\langle x', y' \rangle$ such that $\langle x, y \rangle \text{R} \langle x', y' \rangle$ and $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x', y' \rangle \models \lambda$;
- $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models [\text{R}] \lambda$ iff, for every $\langle x', y' \rangle$ with $\langle x, y \rangle \text{R} \langle x', y' \rangle$, we have $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x', y' \rangle \models \lambda$;
- $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models [\text{U}] (\lambda_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \lambda_k \rightarrow \lambda)$ iff, for every $\langle x', y' \rangle \in \text{int}(\mathfrak{T})$ with $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x', y' \rangle \models \lambda_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$, we have $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x', y' \rangle \models \lambda$;
- $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$ iff $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models \varphi_1$ and $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models \varphi_2$.

A model \mathfrak{M} based on \mathfrak{T} *satisfies* φ if $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models \varphi$, for some $\langle x, y \rangle \in \text{int}(\mathfrak{T})$. Given a class \mathcal{C} of linear orders, we say that a formula φ is *\mathcal{C} -satisfiable* (respectively, *$\mathcal{C}(\leq)$ - or $\mathcal{C}(<)$ -satisfiable*) if it is satisfiable in an HS-model based on some order from \mathcal{C} under the arbitrary (respectively, reflexive or irreflexive) semantics.

To facilitate readability, we use the following *syntactic sugar*, where $\psi = \lambda_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \lambda_k$:

²It may be of interest to note that the query language SQL:2011 has seven interval temporal operators three of which are under the reflexive semantics and four under the irreflexive one [31].

³Note that if we consider $\mathfrak{T} = (T, \leq)$ as a unimodal Kripke frame, then $(\text{int}(\mathfrak{T}), \text{E}, \bar{\text{B}})$ with the reflexive semantics is an expanding subframe of the *modal product frame* $\mathfrak{T} \times \mathfrak{T}$; see [23, Section 3.9].




Figure 1: The interval relations and their 2D representation.

- $[U](\psi \rightarrow \neg\lambda)$ as an abbreviation for $[U](\psi \wedge \lambda \rightarrow \perp)$;
- $[U](\psi \rightarrow \lambda'_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \lambda'_n)$ as an abbreviation for

$$\bigwedge_{i=1}^n [U](\psi \rightarrow \lambda'_i);$$

- $[U](\psi \rightarrow [R](\lambda'_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \lambda'_n \rightarrow \lambda))$ as an abbreviation for

$$[U](\psi \rightarrow [R]p) \wedge [U](p \wedge \lambda'_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \lambda'_n \rightarrow \lambda),$$

where p is a fresh variable, and similarly for $\langle R \rangle$ in place of $[R]$.

Note also that $[U](\langle R \rangle \lambda \wedge \psi \rightarrow \lambda')$ is equivalent to $[U](\lambda \rightarrow [\bar{R}](\psi \rightarrow \lambda'))$. This allows us to use $\langle R \rangle$ on the left-hand side of the clauses in $\mathcal{HS}_{horn}^\square$ -formulas, and $[R]$ on the right-hand side of the clauses in $\mathcal{HS}_{horn}^\diamond$ -formulas.

3 Tractability of $\mathcal{HS}_{horn}^\square$

Let $\mathfrak{T} = (T, \leq)$ be a linear order, $\langle a, b \rangle \in \text{int}(\mathfrak{T})$, and let φ be an $\mathcal{HS}_{horn}^\square$ -formula. Suppose we want to check whether there exists a model \mathfrak{M} such that $\mathfrak{M}, \langle a, b \rangle \models \varphi$ under the reflexive (or irreflexive) semantics, in which case we will say that φ is $\langle a, b \rangle$ -satisfiable in $\mathfrak{T}(\leq)$ (respectively, $\mathfrak{T}(<)$). Let $\triangleleft \in \{\leq, <\}$. We set

$$\mathfrak{V}_\varphi = \{\lambda @ \langle a, b \rangle \mid \lambda \text{ an initial condition of } \varphi\}$$

and denote by $\text{cl}(\mathfrak{V}_\varphi)$ the result of applying non-recursively the following rules to \mathfrak{V}_φ , where R is any interval relation in $\mathfrak{T}(\triangleleft)$:

- (c1) if $[R]\lambda @ \langle x, y \rangle \in \mathfrak{V}_\varphi$, then we add to \mathfrak{V}_φ all $\lambda @ \langle x', y' \rangle$ such that $\langle x', y' \rangle \in \text{int}(\mathfrak{T})$ and $\langle x, y \rangle R \langle x', y' \rangle$;
- (c2) if $\lambda @ \langle x', y' \rangle \in \mathfrak{V}_\varphi$ for all $\langle x', y' \rangle \in \text{int}(\mathfrak{T})$ such that $\langle x, y \rangle R \langle x', y' \rangle$ and $[R]\lambda$ occurs in φ , then we add $[R]\lambda @ \langle x, y \rangle$ to \mathfrak{V}_φ ;
- (c3) if $[U](\lambda_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \lambda_k \rightarrow \lambda)$ is a clause of φ and $\lambda_i @ \langle x, y \rangle \in \mathfrak{V}_\varphi$, for $1 \leq i \leq k$, then we add $\lambda @ \langle x, y \rangle$ to \mathfrak{V}_φ .

Now, set $\text{cl}^0(\mathfrak{V}_\varphi) = \mathfrak{V}_\varphi$ and, for any successor ordinal $\alpha + 1$ and limit ordinal β ,

$$\text{cl}^{\alpha+1}(\mathfrak{V}_\varphi) = \text{cl}(\text{cl}^\alpha(\mathfrak{V}_\varphi)), \quad \text{cl}^\beta(\mathfrak{V}_\varphi) = \bigcup_{\alpha < \beta} \text{cl}^\alpha(\mathfrak{V}_\varphi) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{cl}^*(\mathfrak{V}_\varphi) = \bigcup_{\gamma \text{ an ordinal}} \text{cl}^\gamma(\mathfrak{V}_\varphi).$$

Define an \mathcal{HS} -model $\mathfrak{R}_\varphi^{(a,b)} = (\mathfrak{F}_\mathfrak{T}, \nu)$ based on $\mathfrak{T}(\triangleleft)$ by taking, for every variable p ,

$$\nu(p) = \{\langle x, y \rangle \mid p @ \langle x, y \rangle \in \text{cl}^*(\mathfrak{V}_\varphi)\}.$$

Theorem 1. *An $\mathcal{HS}_{\text{horn}}^\square$ -formula φ is $\langle a, b \rangle$ -satisfiable in $\mathfrak{T}(\triangleleft)$ if and only if $\perp @ \langle x, y \rangle \notin \text{cl}^*(\mathfrak{V}_\varphi)$. Furthermore, if some model \mathfrak{M} over $\mathfrak{T}(\triangleleft)$ satisfies φ at $\langle a, b \rangle$, then $\mathfrak{R}_\varphi^{(a,b)}, \langle a, b \rangle \models \varphi$ and, for any $\langle x, y \rangle \in \text{int}(\mathfrak{T})$ and any variable p , $\mathfrak{R}_\varphi^{(a,b)}, \langle x, y \rangle \models p$ implies $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models p$.*

Proof. Suppose $\perp @ \langle x, y \rangle \notin \text{cl}^*(\mathfrak{V}_\varphi)$. It is easily shown by induction that we have $\lambda @ \langle x, y \rangle \in \text{cl}^*(\mathfrak{V}_\varphi)$ iff $\mathfrak{R}_\varphi^{(a,b)}, \langle x, y \rangle \models \lambda$. It follows that $\mathfrak{R}_\varphi^{(a,b)}, \langle a, b \rangle \models \varphi$. Suppose also that $\mathfrak{M}, \langle a, b \rangle \models \varphi$, for some model \mathfrak{M} over $\mathfrak{T}(\triangleleft)$. Denote by \mathfrak{V} the set of $\lambda @ \langle x, y \rangle$ such that λ occurs in φ , $\langle x, y \rangle \in \text{int}(\mathfrak{T})$ and $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models \lambda$. Clearly, \mathfrak{V} is closed under the rules for cl , and so $\text{cl}^*(\mathfrak{V}_\varphi) \subseteq \mathfrak{V}$. This observation also shows that if φ is $\langle a, b \rangle$ -satisfiable in $\mathfrak{T}(\triangleleft)$ then $\perp @ \langle x, y \rangle \notin \text{cl}^*(\mathfrak{V}_\varphi)$. \square

If $\perp @ \langle x, y \rangle \notin \text{cl}^*(\mathfrak{V}_\varphi)$, we call $\mathfrak{R}_\varphi^{(a,b)}$ the *canonical model of φ based on $\mathfrak{T}(\triangleleft)$* . Our next aim is to show that if (i) $\mathfrak{T} \in \text{Dis}$ and \triangleleft is \leq , or (ii) $\mathfrak{T} \in \text{Den}$ and $\triangleleft \in \{\leq, <\}$, then there is a finite multi-modal Kripke frame $\mathfrak{Z}^{(a,b)}$ with a set of words Z and an accessibility relation R , for every interval relation R , and a surjective map $f: \text{int}(\mathfrak{T}) \rightarrow Z$ such that the following conditions hold:

- (p1) if $\langle x, y \rangle R \langle x', y' \rangle$ then $f(\langle x, y \rangle) R f(\langle x', y' \rangle)$;
- (p2) if $z R z'$ then, for every $\langle x, y \rangle \in f^{-1}(z)$, there is $\langle x', y' \rangle \in f^{-1}(z')$ with $\langle x, y \rangle R \langle x', y' \rangle$;
- (p3) for any variable p and any $z \in Z$, either $f^{-1}(z) \cap \nu(p) = \emptyset$ or $f^{-1}(z) \subseteq \nu(p)$.

In modal logic, a surjection respecting the first two properties is called a *p-morphism* (or *bounded morphism*) from $\mathfrak{F}_\mathfrak{T}$ to $\mathfrak{Z}^{(a,b)}$ (see, e.g., [15, 26]). It is well-known that if f is a p-morphism from $\mathfrak{F}_\mathfrak{T}$ to $\mathfrak{Z}^{(a,b)}$ and φ is $f(\langle a, b \rangle)$ -satisfiable in $\mathfrak{Z}^{(a,b)}$ then φ is $\langle a, b \rangle$ -satisfiable in $\mathfrak{T}(\triangleleft)$. Moreover, if the third condition also holds and $\mathfrak{R}_\varphi^{(a,b)}, \langle a, b \rangle \models \varphi$, then φ is $f(\langle a, b \rangle)$ -satisfiable in $\mathfrak{Z}^{(a,b)}$. Indeed, in this case f is a p-morphism from the canonical model $\mathfrak{R}_\varphi^{(a,b)}$ onto the model $(\mathfrak{Z}^{(a,b)}, \nu')$, where $\nu'(p) = \{z \mid f^{-1}(z) \subseteq \nu(p)\}$.

To construct $\mathfrak{Z}^{(a,b)}$ and f , we require a few definitions. If $a < b$, we denote by $\text{sec}_\mathfrak{T}(a, b)$ the set of non-empty subsets of T of the form $(-\infty, a)$, $[a, a]$, (a, b) , $[b, b]$ and (b, ∞) , where $(-\infty, a) = \{x \in T \mid x < a\}$ and $(b, \infty) = \{x \in T \mid x > b\}$. If $a = b$, then $\text{sec}_\mathfrak{T}(a, b)$ consists of non-empty sets of the form $(-\infty, a)$, $[a, a]$ and (a, ∞) . We call each $\sigma \in \text{sec}_\mathfrak{T}(a, b)$ an (a, b) -*section* of \mathfrak{T} . Clearly, $\text{sec}_\mathfrak{T}(a, b)$ is a partition of T . Given $\sigma, \sigma' \in \text{sec}_\mathfrak{T}(a, b)$, we write $\sigma \preceq \sigma'$ if there exist $x \in \sigma$ and $x' \in \sigma'$ such that $\langle x, x' \rangle \in \text{int}(\mathfrak{T})$. The definition of $\mathfrak{Z}^{(a,b)}$ depends on the type of the linear order \mathfrak{T} and the semantics for the interval relations.

Case $\mathfrak{T}(\leq)$, for $\mathfrak{T} \in \text{Dis} \cup \text{Den}$. If $\mathfrak{T} = (T, \leq)$ is a linear order from Dis or Den and the semantics is reflexive, then we divide $\text{int}(\mathfrak{T})$ into *zones* of the form

$$- \zeta_{\sigma, \sigma'} = \{\langle x, x' \rangle \in \text{int}(\mathfrak{T}) \mid x \in \sigma, x' \in \sigma'\}, \text{ where } \sigma, \sigma' \in \text{sec}_\mathfrak{T}(a, b) \text{ and } \sigma \preceq \sigma'.$$

For $a < b$ (or $a = b$), there are at most 15 (respectively, at most 6) disjoint non-empty zones covering $\text{int}(\mathfrak{T})$; see Fig. 2. These zones form the set Z of worlds in the frame $\mathfrak{Z}^{(a,b)}$, and for any $\zeta, \zeta' \in Z$ and any interval relation R , we set $\zeta R \zeta'$ iff there exist $\langle x, y \rangle \in \zeta$ and $\langle x', y' \rangle \in \zeta'$ such that $\langle x, y \rangle R \langle x', y' \rangle$. Finally, we define a map $f: \text{int}(\mathfrak{T}) \rightarrow Z$ by taking $f(\langle x, y \rangle) = \zeta$ iff $\langle x, y \rangle \in \zeta$. By definition, f is ‘onto’ and satisfies (p1). Condition (p2) is checked by direct inspection of Fig. 2, while condition (p3) is an immediate consequence of the following lemma:

Lemma 2. *For any zone ζ and any literal λ in φ , if $\mathfrak{R}_\varphi^{(i,j)}, \langle x, y \rangle \models \lambda$ for some $\langle x, y \rangle \in \zeta$, then $\mathfrak{R}_\varphi^{(i,j)}, \langle x, y \rangle \models \lambda$ for all $\langle x, y \rangle \in \zeta$.*




Figure 2: Zones in the canonical models over $\text{Dis}(\leq)$ and $\text{Den}(\leq)$.

Proof. It suffices to show that if $\lambda@ \langle x, y \rangle \in \text{cl}^{\alpha+1}(\mathfrak{A}_\varphi)$ for some $\langle x, y \rangle \in \zeta$, then $\lambda@ \langle x', y' \rangle \in \text{cl}^{\alpha+1}(\mathfrak{A}_\varphi)$ for all $\langle x', y' \rangle \in \zeta$, assuming that $\text{cl}^\alpha(\mathfrak{A}_\varphi)$ satisfies this property, which is the case for $\alpha = 0$.

Suppose $\langle x, y \rangle \in \zeta$ and $\lambda@ \langle x, y \rangle \in \text{cl}^{\alpha+1}(\mathfrak{A}_\varphi)$ is obtained by an application of (cl1) to $[\text{R}]\lambda \langle u, v \rangle \in \text{cl}^\alpha(\mathfrak{A}_\varphi)$ with $\langle u, v \rangle \text{R} \langle x, y \rangle$ and $\langle u, v \rangle \in \zeta'$. Take any $\langle x', y' \rangle \in \zeta$. By (p2), there is $\langle u', v' \rangle \in \zeta'$ such that $\langle u', v' \rangle \text{R} \langle x', y' \rangle$. By our assumption, $[\text{R}]\lambda \langle u', v' \rangle \in \text{cl}^\alpha(\mathfrak{A}_\varphi)$, and so an application of (c1) to it gives $\lambda@ \langle x', y' \rangle \in \text{cl}^{\alpha+1}(\mathfrak{A}_\varphi)$.

Suppose next that $\langle x, y \rangle \in \zeta$ and $[\text{R}]\lambda@ \langle x, y \rangle \in \text{cl}^{\alpha+1}(\mathfrak{A}_\varphi)$ is obtained by an application of (cl2). Then $\lambda \langle u, v \rangle \in \text{cl}^\alpha(\mathfrak{A}_\varphi)$ for all $\langle u, v \rangle$ with $\langle x, y \rangle \text{R} \langle u, v \rangle$. Take any $\langle x', y' \rangle \in \zeta$. We show that $\lambda \langle u', v' \rangle \in \text{cl}^\alpha(\mathfrak{A}_\varphi)$ for every $\lambda \langle u', v' \rangle$ with $\langle x', y' \rangle \text{R} \langle u', v' \rangle$, from which $[\text{R}]\lambda@ \langle x', y' \rangle \in \text{cl}^{\alpha+1}(\mathfrak{A}_\varphi)$ will follow. Let $\langle u', v' \rangle \in \zeta'$. By (p1), $\zeta \text{R} \zeta'$ and, by (p2), $\langle x, y \rangle \text{R} \langle u, v \rangle$ for some $\langle u, v \rangle \in \zeta'$ such that $\langle x, y \rangle \text{R} \langle u, v \rangle$. Then $\lambda \langle u, v \rangle \in \text{cl}^\alpha(\mathfrak{A}_\varphi)$ and, by our assumption, $\lambda \langle u', v' \rangle \in \text{cl}^\alpha(\mathfrak{A}_\varphi)$.


The case of rule (cl3) is obvious. \square

Note that Lemma 2 does not hold for $\mathfrak{T}(<)$. Indeed, we may have punctual intervals $\langle y, y \rangle$ (for $y \notin \{a, b\}$) such that $\mathfrak{R}_\varphi^{(a,b)}, \langle y, y \rangle \models [\text{E}] \perp$ but $\mathfrak{R}_\varphi^{(a,b)}, \langle x, y \rangle \not\models [\text{E}] \perp$ for $x < y$, with $\langle x, y \rangle$ from the same zone as $\langle y, y \rangle$.

Case $\mathfrak{T}(<)$, for $\mathfrak{T} \in \text{Den}$. If \mathfrak{T} is a dense linear order and the semantics is irreflexive, we divide $\text{int}(\mathfrak{T})$ into zones of three types:

- $\zeta_{\sigma, \sigma'} = \{\langle x, x' \rangle \in \text{int}(\mathfrak{T}) \mid x \in \sigma, x' \in \sigma'\}$, where $\sigma, \sigma' \in \text{sec}_{\mathfrak{T}}(a, b)$, $\sigma \preceq \sigma'$ and $\sigma \neq \sigma'$;
- $\zeta_\sigma = \{\langle x, x' \rangle \in \text{int}(\mathfrak{T}) \mid x, x' \in \sigma, x \neq x'\}$, where $\sigma \in \text{sec}_{\mathfrak{T}}(a, b)$;
- $\zeta_\sigma^\bullet = \{\langle x, x \rangle \in \text{int}(\mathfrak{T}) \mid x \in \sigma\}$, where $\sigma \in \text{sec}_{\mathfrak{T}}(a, b)$.

Now, for $a < b$ (or $a = b$), we have at most 18 (respectively, at most 8) disjoint non-empty zones covering $\text{int}(\mathfrak{T})$; see Fig. 3. It is again easy to see that the map $f: \text{int}(\mathfrak{T}) \rightarrow Z$ defined by taking $f(\langle x, y \rangle) = \zeta$ iff $\langle x, y \rangle \in \zeta$ satisfies (p1)–(p3). The fact that \mathfrak{T} is dense is required for (p2). For discrete \mathfrak{T} , condition (p2) does not hold. For example, for $\mathfrak{T} = (\mathbb{Z}, <)$, $a = 0$ and $b = 3$, we have $\zeta_{(a,b)}^\bullet \bar{\text{E}} \zeta_{(a,b), (a,b)}$ but for $\langle 2, 2 \rangle \in \zeta_{(a,b)}^\bullet$ there is no $\langle x', y' \rangle \in \zeta_{(a,b), (a,b)}$ such that $\langle 2, 2 \rangle \bar{\text{E}} \langle x', y' \rangle$ as shown in the picture below:



Thus, in both cases the constructed function $f: \text{int}(\mathfrak{T}) \rightarrow Z$ satisfies conditions (p1)–(p3), and so, using Theorem 1, we obtain:




Figure 3: Zones in the canonical models over $\text{Den}(\langle \cdot \rangle)$.

Theorem 3. Suppose $\mathfrak{T} \in \text{Dis}$ and \triangleleft is \leq , or $\mathfrak{T} \in \text{Den}$ and $\triangleleft \in \{\leq, <\}$. Then an $\mathcal{HS}_{\text{horn}}^{\square}$ -formula φ is $\langle a, b \rangle$ -satisfiable in $\mathfrak{T}(\triangleleft)$ iff φ is $f(\langle a, b \rangle)$ -satisfiable in $\mathfrak{Z}^{\langle a, b \rangle}$.

To check whether φ is $f(\langle a, b \rangle)$ -satisfiable in $\mathfrak{Z}^{\langle a, b \rangle}$, we take the set

$$\mathfrak{U}_{\varphi} = \{\lambda @ f(\langle a, b \rangle) \mid \lambda \text{ an initial condition of } \varphi\}$$

and apply to it the following obvious modifications of rules (c11)–(c13):

if $[R]\lambda @ \zeta \in \mathfrak{U}_{\varphi}$, then we add to \mathfrak{U}_{φ} all $\lambda @ \zeta'$ such that $\zeta R \zeta'$;

if $\lambda @ \zeta' \in \mathfrak{U}_{\varphi}$ for all $\zeta' \in Z$ with $\zeta R \zeta'$ and $[R]\lambda$ occurs in φ , then we add $[R]\lambda @ \zeta$ to \mathfrak{U}_{φ} ;

if $[U](\lambda_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \lambda_k \rightarrow \lambda)$ occurs in φ and $\lambda_i @ \zeta_i \in \mathfrak{U}_{\varphi}$, $1 \leq i \leq k$, then add $\lambda @ \zeta$ to \mathfrak{U}_{φ} .

It is readily seen that at most $|Z| \cdot |\varphi|$ applications are enough to construct a fixed point $\text{cl}^*(\mathfrak{U}_{\varphi})$. Similarly to Theorem 1, we then show that φ is $f(\langle a, b \rangle)$ -satisfiable in $\mathfrak{Z}^{\langle a, b \rangle}$ iff $\text{cl}^*(\mathfrak{U}_{\varphi})$ does not contain $\perp @ f(\langle a, b \rangle)$.

Theorem 4. For any class Dis' of discrete linear orders and any class Den' of dense linear orders, $\text{Dis}'(\leq)$ -, $\text{Den}'(\leq)$ - and $\text{Den}'(<)$ -satisfiability of $\mathcal{HS}_{\text{horn}}^{\square}$ -formulas are all P-complete.

Proof. Observe first that, for each of $\text{Dis}'(\leq)$, $\text{Den}'(\leq)$, $\text{Den}'(<)$, there are at most 8 pairwise non-isomorphic frames of the form $\mathfrak{Z}^{\langle a, b \rangle}$. As we saw above, checking whether φ is satisfiable in one of them can be done in polynomial time. It remains to apply Theorem 3. The matching lower bound holds already for propositional Horn formulas; see, e.g., [20, Theorem 4.2] and references therein. \square

Remark 5. In the context of potential applications, it would be more interesting to allow $\mathcal{HS}_{\text{horn}}^{\square}$ formulas with initial conditions of the form $p @ \langle a, b \rangle$, where $\langle a, b \rangle \in \text{int}(\mathfrak{T})$ for the linear order \mathfrak{T} under consideration. The initial conditions would represent temporal data, while the clauses formalise the background knowledge. The zonal representation of canonical models above can be extended to this case. However, the number of zones will be quadratic in the number of the initial conditions; see [6].

4 Lower bounds

In this section, we show that tractability results such as Theorem 4 are not possible when some kind of ‘controlled infinity’ becomes expressible in the formalism. When simulating complex problems in \mathcal{HS} -models, we always begin by singling out those intervals—call them *units*—that are used in the simulation. It should be clear that if an \mathcal{HS} -fragment is capable of

- (i) forcing an ω -type infinite (or unbounded finite) sequence of units, and

(ii) passing polynomial-size information from one unit to the next,

then it is PSPACE-hard (because polynomial space bounded Turing machine computations can be encoded). It is readily seen that \mathcal{HS}_{horn} can easily do both (i) and (ii). We show that, in certain situations, we can encode Horn clauses by means of core clauses, and thus achieve (i) and (ii) already in the core fragments. In particular, this is the case:

- for \mathcal{HS}_{core} over any class of unbounded timelines under arbitrary semantics (Theorem 7), and even
- for $\mathcal{HS}_{core}^{\square}$ over any class of unbounded discrete timelines under the irreflexive semantics (Theorem 8).

Further, if a fragment is expressive enough to

- (iii) force an $\omega \times \omega$ -like grid-structure of units, and
- (iv) pass (polynomial-size) information from each unit representing some grid-point to the unit representing its right- and up-neighbours in the grid,

then it becomes possible to encode undecidable problems such as $\omega \times \omega$ -tilings, Turing or counter machine computations. We show this to be the case for the following fragments:

- $\mathcal{HS}_{horn}^{\diamond}$ over any class of unbounded timelines under arbitrary semantics (Theorem 9),
- \mathcal{HS}_{core} over any class of unbounded timelines under the irreflexive semantics (Theorem 10), and
- $\mathcal{HS}_{horn}^{\square}$ over any class of unbounded discrete timelines under the irreflexive semantics (Theorem 11).

Although \mathcal{HS} -models are always grid-like by definition, it is not straightforward to achieve (iii)–(iv) in them. Even if we consider the irreflexive semantics and discrete underlying linear orders, \mathcal{HS} does not provide us with horizontal and vertical next-time operators. The undecidability proofs for (Boolean) \mathcal{HS} -satisfiability given by Halpern and Shoham [27] and Marx and Reynolds [34] (for irreflexive semantics), by Reynolds and Zakharyashev [42] and Gabbay et al. [23] (for arbitrary semantics), and by Bresolin et al. [8] (for the \overline{BE} , \overline{BE} and \overline{BE} fragments with irreflexive semantics) all employ the following solution to this problem:

- (v) Instead of using a grid-like subset of an \mathcal{HS} -model as units representing grid-locations, we use some Cantor-style enumeration of either the whole $\omega \times \omega$ -grid or its north-western octant $nw_{\omega \times \omega}$ (see Fig. 4), and then force a *unique* infinite (or unbounded finite) sequence of units representing this enumeration (or an unbounded finite prefix of it).
- (vi) Then we use some ‘up- and right-pointers’ in the model to access the unit representing the grid-location immediately above and to the right of the current one.

Here, we follow a similar approach. The proofs of Theorems 9–11 differ in how (v) and (vi) are achieved by the capabilities of the different formalisms. In particular:

- The way used in the proof of Theorem 9 is similar to how it is done in [34, 42, 23] where the $\omega \times \omega$ -grid is encoded in modal products of linear orders, and in [24] where the $\omega \times \omega$ -grid is encoded by modal products of various transitive (not necessarily linear) relations, in all cases regardless whether the relations in question are irreflexive or reflexive. It turns out that, using some additional ‘tricks’, this technique is applicable for $\mathcal{HS}_{horn}^{\diamond}$ -formulas.
- It is not clear whether the above method can be applied to the case of \mathcal{HS}_{core} . In the proof of Theorem 10 we achieve (for the irreflexive semantics) (v) and (vi) in a different way, similar to the one in [27].
- Both techniques above make an essential use of $\langle R \rangle$ -operators. In order to achieve (v) and (vi) using $\mathcal{HS}_{horn}^{\square}$ -formulas with the irreflexive semantics and discrete linear orders, in the proof of Theorem 11 we provide a completely different encoding of the $nw_{\omega \times \omega}$ -grid.




Figure 4: An enumeration of the $nw_{\omega \times \omega}$ -grid.

4.1 Turing machines

As all of our lower bound proofs use various problems for Turing machines, we begin by fixing the notation and the terminology about them. A *single-tape right-infinite deterministic Turing Machine* (TM, for short) is a tuple $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, q_0, q_f, \delta_{\mathcal{A}})$, where Q is a finite set of *states* containing, in particular, the *initial state* q_0 and the *halt state* q_f , Σ is the *tape alphabet* (with a distinguished *blank symbol* $\sqcup \in \Sigma$), and $\delta_{\mathcal{A}}$ is the *transition function*, where we use the symbol $\mathcal{L} \notin \Sigma$ to mark the leftmost cell of the tape:

$$\delta_{\mathcal{A}} : (Q - \{q_f\}) \times (\Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\}) \rightarrow Q \times (\Sigma \cup \{L, R\}).$$

The transition function transforms each pair of the form (q, s) into one of the following pairs:

- (q', s') (write s' and change the state to q');
- (q', L) (move one cell left and change the state to q');
- (q', R) (move one cell right and change the state to q'),

where L and R are fresh symbols. We assume that if $s = \mathcal{L}$ (i.e., the leftmost cell of the tape is active) then $\delta_{\mathcal{A}}(q, s) = (q', R)$ (that is, having reached the leftmost cell, the machine always moves to the right). We set $\text{size}(\mathcal{A}) = |Q \cup \Sigma \cup \delta_{\mathcal{A}}|$. *Configurations* of \mathcal{A} are infinite sequences of the form

$$C = (s_0, s_1, \dots, s_i, \dots, s_n, \sqcup, \dots),$$

where either $s_0 = \mathcal{L}$ and all s_1, \dots, s_n save one, say s_i , are in Σ , while s_i belongs to $Q \times \Sigma$ and represents the *active cell* and the *current state*, or $s_0 = (q, \mathcal{L})$ for some $q \in Q$ (s_0 is the active cell), and all s_1, \dots, s_n are in Σ . In both cases all cells of the tape located to the right of s_n contain \sqcup . We assume that the machine always starts with empty tape (all cells of which are blank), and so the *initial configuration* is represented by the sequence

$$C_0 = ((q_0, \mathcal{L}), \sqcup, \sqcup, \dots).$$

We denote by $(C_n \mid n < H)$ the unique sequence of subsequent configurations of \mathcal{A} starting with the empty tape—the unique *computation of \mathcal{A} with empty input*—where

$$H = \begin{cases} n + 1, & n \text{ is the smallest number with } (q_f, s) \text{ occurring in } C_n \text{ for some } s, \\ \omega, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If $H < \omega$, we say that \mathcal{A} *halts with empty input*, and call C_{H-1} the *halting configuration of \mathcal{A}* . If $H = \omega$, we say that \mathcal{A} *diverges with empty input*. We denote by $C_n(m)$ the m th symbol in C_n .

In our lower bound proofs, we use the following Turing machine problems [38]:

HALTING: (Σ_1^0 -hard)

Given a Turing machine \mathcal{A} , does it halt with empty input?

NON-HALTING: (Π_1^0 -hard)

Given a Turing machine \mathcal{A} , does it diverge with empty input?

PSPACE-BOUND HALTING: (PSPACE-hard)

Given a Turing machine \mathcal{A} whose computation with empty input uses at most $\text{poly}(\text{size}(\mathcal{A}))$ tape cells for some polynomial function $\text{poly}()$, does \mathcal{A} halt on empty input?

PSPACE-BOUND NON-HALTING: (PSPACE-hard)

Given a Turing machine \mathcal{A} whose computation with empty input uses at most $\text{poly}(\text{size}(\mathcal{A}))$ tape cells for some polynomial function $\text{poly}()$, does \mathcal{A} diverge on empty input?

4.2 PSPACE-hardness of core fragments

As we have already observed, proving PSPACE-hardness in the case of $\mathcal{HS}_{\text{horn}}$ is relatively easy. In order to do this in the case $\mathcal{HS}_{\text{core}}$, we use the following *binary implication trick* to capture at least some of the Horn features in $\mathcal{HS}_{\text{core}}$. For any literals λ_1 , λ_2 , and λ , we define the formula $[\lambda_1 \wedge \lambda_2 \Rightarrow_H \lambda]$ as the conjunction of

$$[\mathbf{U}](\lambda_1 \rightarrow \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle \tilde{\lambda}_1) \wedge [\mathbf{U}](\lambda_2 \rightarrow \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle \tilde{\lambda}_2), \quad (4)$$

$$[\mathbf{U}](\tilde{\lambda}_2 \rightarrow \neg \langle \bar{\mathbf{B}} \rangle \tilde{\lambda}_1), \quad (5)$$

$$[\mathbf{U}](\tilde{\lambda}_1 \rightarrow \tilde{\lambda} \wedge [\bar{\mathbf{B}}] \tilde{\lambda}) \wedge [\mathbf{U}](\tilde{\lambda}_2 \rightarrow [\mathbf{B}] \tilde{\lambda}), \quad (6)$$

$$[\mathbf{U}](\langle \mathbf{A} \rangle \tilde{\lambda} \rightarrow \lambda), \quad (7)$$

where $\tilde{\lambda}_1$, $\tilde{\lambda}_2$, and $\tilde{\lambda}$ are fresh variables. The following claim holds for arbitrary semantics:

CLAIM 4.1. *Suppose \mathfrak{M} is an \mathcal{HS} -model based on some linear order \mathfrak{T} and satisfying $[\lambda_1 \wedge \lambda_2 \Rightarrow_H \lambda]$. For all y in \mathfrak{T} , if there exist $x_1, x_2 \leq y$ such that $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x_1, y \rangle \models \lambda_1$ and $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x_2, y \rangle \models \lambda_2$, then $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models \lambda$ for all $x \leq y$.*

Proof. Suppose $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x_1, y \rangle \models \lambda_1$ and $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x_2, y \rangle \models \lambda_2$. Take some $x \leq y$. By (4), there exist $z_1, z_2 \geq y$ such that $\mathfrak{M}, \langle y, z_1 \rangle \models \tilde{\lambda}_1$ and $\mathfrak{M}, \langle y, z_2 \rangle \models \tilde{\lambda}_2$. Then $z_1 \leq z_2$ by (5). So $\mathfrak{M}, \langle y, z \rangle \models \tilde{\lambda}$ for all $z \geq y$ by (6), and therefore $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models \lambda$ by (7). \square

Soundness: Observe that in order to satisfy $[\lambda_1 \wedge \lambda_2 \Rightarrow_H \lambda]$ the following are necessary:

- λ is *horizontally stable*: for every y , we have $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models \lambda$ iff $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x', y \rangle \models \lambda$ for all x' ;
- if $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x', y \rangle \not\models \lambda$ (and so $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \not\models \lambda$ for all x) and $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x'', y \rangle \models \lambda_1$ for some x', x'' , then $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \not\models \lambda_2$ should hold for all x .

We use the binary implication trick to prove that $\mathcal{HS}_{\text{core}}$ is PSPACE-hard for arbitrary semantics (reflexive, irreflexive, mixed).

Theorem 6. (*$\mathcal{HS}_{\text{core}}$, arbitrary semantics*)

(i) For any class \mathcal{C} of linear orders containing an infinite order, \mathcal{C} -satisfiability of $\mathcal{HS}_{\text{core}}$ -formulas is PSPACE-hard. (ii) Fin-satisfiability of $\mathcal{HS}_{\text{core}}$ -formulas is PSPACE-hard.

Proof. (i) We reduce ‘PSPACE-bound non-halting’ to \mathcal{C} -satisfiability. Let \mathcal{A} be a Turing machine whose computation on empty input uses $< \text{poly}(\text{size}(\mathcal{A}))$ tape cells for some polynomial function $\text{poly}()$, and let $N = \text{poly}(\text{size}(\mathcal{A}))$. Then we may assume that each configuration \mathcal{C} of \mathcal{A} is not infinite but of length N , and \mathcal{A} never visits the last cell of any configuration. Let $\Gamma_{\mathcal{A}} = \Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\} \cup (Q \times (\Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\}))$. For each $i < N$ and $z \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{A}}$, we introduce two propositional variables: cell_i^z (to encode that ‘the content of the i th cell is z ’) and its ‘copy’ $\tilde{\text{cell}}_i^z$.

Then we can express the uniqueness of cell-contents by

$$\bigwedge_{i < N} \bigwedge_{z \neq z' \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{A}}} [\mathbf{U}](\text{cell}_i^z \rightarrow \neg \text{cell}_i^{z'}), \quad (8)$$

and initialise the computation by

$$\text{cell}_0^{(q_0, \mathcal{L})} \wedge \bigwedge_{0 < i < N} \text{cell}_i^{\perp}. \quad (9)$$

Now we pass information from one configuration to the next, using the ‘copy’ variables and the ‘binary implication trick’:

$$[\mathbf{U}](\text{cell}_i^{(q,s)} \rightarrow \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle \overline{\text{cell}}_i^{(q,s)}), \quad \text{for } i < N, (q, s) \in (Q - \{q_f\}) \times (\Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\}), \quad (10)$$

$$[\text{cell}_i^{(q,s)} \wedge \text{cell}_j^z \Rightarrow_H \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle \overline{\text{cell}}_j^z], \quad \text{for } i, j < N, (q, s) \in (Q - \{q_f\}) \times (\Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\}), z \in \Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\}, \quad (11)$$

$$[\mathbf{U}](\overline{\text{cell}}_i^{(q,s)} \rightarrow \neg \langle \mathbf{B} \rangle \overline{\text{cell}}_j^z). \quad (12)$$

We can force that all $\overline{\text{cell}}_i^{(q,s)}$ -intervals are different (meaning none of them is punctual) by the conjunction of, say,

$$[\mathbf{U}](\overline{\text{cell}}_i^{(q,s)} \rightarrow \text{unit}), \quad \text{for } i < N, (q, s) \in Q \times (\Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\}), \quad (13)$$

$$[\mathbf{U}](\text{unit} \rightarrow \neg [\mathbf{D}]\text{unit}). \quad (14)$$

Finally, we can ensure that the information passed in fact encodes the computation steps of \mathcal{A} by the following formulas. For all $(q, s) \in (Q - \{q_f\}) \times (\Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\})$ and $z \in \Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\}$,

– if $\delta_{\mathcal{A}}(q, s) = (q', s')$, then take the conjunction of

$$[\mathbf{U}](\overline{\text{cell}}_i^{(q,s)} \rightarrow \text{cell}_i^{(q',s')}), \quad \text{for } i < N, \quad (15)$$

$$[\overline{\text{cell}}_i^{(q,s)} \wedge \langle \bar{\mathbf{B}} \rangle \overline{\text{cell}}_j^z \Rightarrow_H \text{cell}_j^z], \quad \text{for } i, j < N, j \neq i; \quad (16)$$

– if $\delta_{\mathcal{A}}(q, s) = (q', R)$, then take the conjunction of

$$[\mathbf{U}](\overline{\text{cell}}_i^{(q,s)} \rightarrow \text{cell}_i^s), \quad \text{for } i < N - 1, \quad (17)$$

$$[\overline{\text{cell}}_i^{(q,s)} \wedge \langle \bar{\mathbf{B}} \rangle \overline{\text{cell}}_{i+1}^z \Rightarrow_H \text{cell}_{i+1}^{(q',z)}], \quad \text{for } i < N - 1, \quad (18)$$

$$[\overline{\text{cell}}_i^{(q,s)} \wedge \langle \bar{\mathbf{B}} \rangle \overline{\text{cell}}_j^z \Rightarrow_H \text{cell}_j^z], \quad \text{for } i < N - 1, j < N, j \neq i, i + 1; \quad (19)$$

– if $\delta_{\mathcal{A}}(q, s) = (q', L)$, then take the conjunction of (32) for $0 < i < N$ and

$$[\overline{\text{cell}}_i^{(q,s)} \wedge \langle \bar{\mathbf{B}} \rangle \overline{\text{cell}}_{i-1}^z \Rightarrow_H \text{cell}_{i-1}^{(q',z)}], \quad \text{for } 0 < i < N, \quad (20)$$

$$[\overline{\text{cell}}_i^{(q,s)} \wedge \langle \bar{\mathbf{B}} \rangle \overline{\text{cell}}_j^z \Rightarrow_H \text{cell}_j^z], \quad \text{for } 0 < i < N, j < N, j \neq i, i - 1. \quad (21)$$

Finally, we force non-halting with

$$[\mathbf{U}](\text{cell}_i^{(q_f, s)} \rightarrow \perp), \quad \text{for } i < N, s \in \Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\}. \quad (22)$$

CLAIM 4.2. *Let $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the conjunction of (23)–(37). If $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ is satisfiable in an \mathcal{HS} -model, then \mathcal{A} diverges with empty input.*

Proof. Take any \mathcal{HS} -model \mathfrak{M} based on a linear order \mathfrak{T} . Suppose $\mathfrak{M}, \langle r, r' \rangle \models \Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$. Then it is not hard to show by induction on n that there is an infinite sequence $u_0 \leq u_1 < u_2 < \dots < u_n < \dots$ of points in \mathfrak{T} such that $u_0 = r$, $u_1 = r'$, and for all $n < \omega$, the interval $\langle u_n, u_{n+1} \rangle$ ‘represents’ the n th configuration \mathcal{C}_n in the infinite computation of \mathcal{A} with empty input in the following sense:

$$\mathfrak{M}, \langle u_n, u_{n+1} \rangle \models \text{cell}_i^z \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathcal{C}_n(i) = z,$$

for all $i < N$ and $z \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{A}}$. □

On the other hand, if \mathcal{A} diverges on empty input, then take some linear order \mathfrak{T} containing an infinite ascending chain $t_0 < t_1 < \dots$ and define an \mathcal{HS} -model $\mathfrak{M} = (\mathfrak{F}_{\mathfrak{T}}, \nu)$ by taking, for all $i < N$ and $z \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{A}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\text{unit}) &= \{ \langle t_{2n}, t_{2n+2} \rangle \mid n < \omega \}, \\ \nu(\text{cell}_i^z) &= \{ \langle x, t_{2n+2} \rangle \mid \mathcal{C}_n(i) = z, n < \omega, x \leq t_{2n+2} \}, \\ \nu(\overline{\text{cell}}_i^z) &= \begin{cases} \{ \langle t_{2n+2}, t_{2n+3} \rangle \mid \mathcal{C}_n(i) = z, n < \omega \}, & \text{if } z \in \Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\}, \\ \{ \langle t_{2n+2}, t_{2n+4} \rangle \mid \mathcal{C}_n(i) = z, n < \omega \}, & \text{if } z \in Q \times (\Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\}). \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to check that $\mathfrak{M}, \langle t_0, t_2 \rangle \models \Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ with arbitrary semantics. The case when \mathfrak{T} contains an infinite descending chain requires ‘symmetrical versions’ of the used formulas and it is left to the reader.

(ii) In the finite case we reduce ‘PSPACE-bound halting’ to Fin-satisfiability. To achieve this, we just omit the conjunct (37) from $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$. Now (25), together with the finiteness of the models force the computation to reach the halting state. □

We use this trick to prove the following:

Theorem 7. (*$\mathcal{HS}_{\text{core}}$, arbitrary semantics*)

(i) For any class \mathcal{C} of linear orders containing an infinite order, \mathcal{C} -satisfiability of $\mathcal{HS}_{\text{core}}$ -formulas is PSPACE-hard. (ii) Fin-satisfiability of $\mathcal{HS}_{\text{core}}$ -formulas is PSPACE-hard.

Proof. (i) We reduce ‘PSPACE-bound non-halting’ to \mathcal{C} -satisfiability. Let \mathcal{A} be a Turing machine whose computation on empty input uses $< \text{poly}(\text{size}(\mathcal{A}))$ tape cells for some polynomial function $\text{poly}()$, and let $N = \text{poly}(\text{size}(\mathcal{A}))$. Then we may assume that each configuration \mathcal{C} of \mathcal{A} is not infinite but of length N , and \mathcal{A} never visits the last cell of any configuration. Let $\Gamma_{\mathcal{A}} = \Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\} \cup (Q \times (\Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\}))$. For each $i < N$ and $z \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{A}}$, we introduce two propositional variables: cell_i^z (to encode that ‘the content of the i th cell is z ’) and its ‘copy’ $\overline{\text{cell}}_i^z$.

Then we can express the uniqueness of cell-contents by

$$\bigwedge_{i < N} \bigwedge_{z \neq z' \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{A}}} [\text{U}](\text{cell}_i^z \rightarrow \neg \text{cell}_i^{z'}), \quad (23)$$

and initialise the computation by

$$\text{cell}_0^{(q_0, \mathcal{L})} \wedge \bigwedge_{0 < i < N} \text{cell}_i^{\perp}. \quad (24)$$

Now we pass information from one configuration to the next, using the ‘copy’ variables and the ‘binary implication trick’:

$$[\text{U}](\text{cell}_i^{(q,s)} \rightarrow \langle \text{A} \rangle \overline{\text{cell}}_i^{(q,s)}), \quad \text{for } i < N, (q, s) \in (Q - \{q_f\}) \times (\Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\}), \quad (25)$$

$$[\text{cell}_i^{(q,s)} \wedge \text{cell}_j^z \Rightarrow_H \langle \text{A} \rangle \overline{\text{cell}}_j^z], \quad \text{for } i, j < N, (q, s) \in (Q - \{q_f\}) \times (\Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\}), z \in \Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\}, \quad (26)$$

$$[\text{U}](\overline{\text{cell}}_i^{(q,s)} \rightarrow \neg \langle \text{B} \rangle \overline{\text{cell}}_j^z). \quad (27)$$

We can force that all $\overline{\text{cell}}_i^{(q,s)}$ -intervals are different (meaning none of them is punctual) by the conjunction of, say,

$$[U](\overline{\text{cell}}_i^{(q,s)} \rightarrow \text{unit}), \quad \text{for } i < N, (q, s) \in Q \times (\Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\}), \quad (28)$$

$$[U](\text{unit} \rightarrow \neg[D]\text{unit}). \quad (29)$$

Finally, we can ensure that the information passed in fact encodes the computation steps of \mathcal{A} by the following formulas. For all $(q, s) \in (Q - \{q_f\}) \times (\Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\})$ and $z \in \Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\}$,

– if $\delta_{\mathcal{A}}(q, s) = (q', s')$, then take the conjunction of

$$[U](\overline{\text{cell}}_i^{(q,s)} \rightarrow \text{cell}_i^{(q',s')}), \quad \text{for } i < N, \quad (30)$$

$$[\overline{\text{cell}}_i^{(q,s)} \wedge \langle \bar{B} \rangle \overline{\text{cell}}_j^z \Rightarrow_H \text{cell}_j^z], \quad \text{for } i, j < N, j \neq i; \quad (31)$$

– if $\delta_{\mathcal{A}}(q, s) = (q', R)$, then take the conjunction of

$$[U](\overline{\text{cell}}_i^{(q,s)} \rightarrow \text{cell}_i^s), \quad \text{for } i < N - 1, \quad (32)$$

$$[\overline{\text{cell}}_i^{(q,s)} \wedge \langle \bar{B} \rangle \overline{\text{cell}}_{i+1}^z \Rightarrow_H \text{cell}_{i+1}^{(q',z)}], \quad \text{for } i < N - 1, \quad (33)$$

$$[\overline{\text{cell}}_i^{(q,s)} \wedge \langle \bar{B} \rangle \overline{\text{cell}}_j^z \Rightarrow_H \text{cell}_j^z], \quad \text{for } i < N - 1, j < N, j \neq i, i + 1; \quad (34)$$

– if $\delta_{\mathcal{A}}(q, s) = (q', L)$, then take the conjunction of (32) for $0 < i < N$ and

$$[\overline{\text{cell}}_i^{(q,s)} \wedge \langle \bar{B} \rangle \overline{\text{cell}}_{i-1}^z \Rightarrow_H \text{cell}_{i-1}^{(q',z)}], \quad \text{for } 0 < i < N, \quad (35)$$

$$[\overline{\text{cell}}_i^{(q,s)} \wedge \langle \bar{B} \rangle \overline{\text{cell}}_j^z \Rightarrow_H \text{cell}_j^z], \quad \text{for } 0 < i < N, j < N, j \neq i, i - 1. \quad (36)$$

Finally, we force non-halting with

$$[U](\text{cell}_i^{(q_f,s)} \rightarrow \perp), \quad \text{for } i < N, s \in \Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\}. \quad (37)$$

CLAIM 4.3. *Let $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the conjunction of (23)–(37). If $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ is satisfiable in an \mathcal{HS} -model, then \mathcal{A} diverges with empty input.*

Proof. Take any \mathcal{HS} -model \mathfrak{M} based on a linear order \mathfrak{T} . Suppose $\mathfrak{M}, \langle r, r' \rangle \models \Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$. Then it is not hard to show by induction on n that there is an infinite sequence $u_0 \leq u_1 < u_2 < \dots < u_n < \dots$ of points in \mathfrak{T} such that $u_0 = r$, $u_1 = r'$, and for all $n < \omega$, the interval $\langle u_n, u_{n+1} \rangle$ ‘represents’ the n th configuration \mathcal{C}_n in the infinite computation of \mathcal{A} with empty input in the following sense:

$$\mathfrak{M}, \langle u_n, u_{n+1} \rangle \models \text{cell}_i^z \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathcal{C}_n(i) = z,$$

for all $i < N$ and $z \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{A}}$. □

On the other hand, if \mathcal{A} diverges on empty input, then take some linear order \mathfrak{T} containing an infinite ascending chain $t_0 < t_1 < \dots$ and define an \mathcal{HS} -model $\mathfrak{M} = (\mathfrak{F}_{\mathfrak{T}}, \nu)$ by taking, for all $i < N$ and $z \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{A}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\text{unit}) &= \{\langle t_{2n}, t_{2n+2} \rangle \mid n < \omega\}, \\ \nu(\text{cell}_i^z) &= \{\langle x, t_{2n+2} \rangle \mid \mathcal{C}_n(i) = z, n < \omega, x \leq t_{2n+2}\}, \\ \nu(\overline{\text{cell}}_i^z) &= \begin{cases} \{\langle t_{2n+2}, t_{2n+3} \rangle \mid \mathcal{C}_n(i) = z, n < \omega\}, & \text{if } z \in \Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\}, \\ \{\langle t_{2n+2}, t_{2n+4} \rangle \mid \mathcal{C}_n(i) = z, n < \omega\}, & \text{if } z \in Q \times (\Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\}). \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to check that $\mathfrak{M}, \langle t_0, t_2 \rangle \models \Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ with arbitrary semantics. The case when \mathfrak{T} contains an infinite descending chain requires ‘symmetrical versions’ of the used formulas and it is left to the reader.

(ii) In the finite case we reduce ‘PSPACE-bound halting’ to Fin-satisfiability. To achieve this, we just omit the conjunct (37) from $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$. Now (25), together with the finiteness of the models force the computation to reach the halting state. □

Theorem 8. ($\mathcal{HS}_{core}^\square$, *discrete orders, irreflexive semantics*)

(i) For any class Dis^∞ of discrete linear orders containing an infinite order, $\text{Dis}^\infty(<)$ -satisfiability of $\mathcal{HS}_{core}^\square$ -formulas is PSPACE-hard. (ii) $\text{Fin}(<)$ -satisfiability of $\mathcal{HS}_{core}^\square$ -formulas is PSPACE-hard.

Proof. (i) We again reduce ‘PSPACE-bound non-halting’ to the satisfiability problem. Take any \mathcal{HS} -model \mathfrak{M} based on a discrete linear order \mathfrak{T} , and consider the irreflexive semantics of the interval relations. In this case there is no need to ‘generate’ an infinite sequence of unit-intervals (which we cannot do without positive $\langle R \rangle$ s), as we obtain such ‘out of the box’ with the conjunction of the following formulas:

$$[U](\text{unit} \rightarrow [E] \perp) \wedge [U]([E] \perp \rightarrow \text{unit}), \quad (38)$$

$$[U](\text{unit} \rightarrow \neg[A] \text{unit}). \quad (39)$$

It should be clear that if $\mathfrak{M} \models (38) \wedge (39)$, then there is an infinite sequence $u_0 < u_1 < \dots < u_n < \dots$ of subsequent points in \mathfrak{T} such that for all x, x' with $x \leq u_n, x' \leq u_m$ for some $n, m < \omega$, we have $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, x' \rangle \models \text{unit}$ iff $x = x' = u_i$ for some $i < \omega$.

Further, it is easy to pass information from one unit-interval to the next, as we have a ‘next-time operator w.r.t.’ the above unit-sequence. Namely,

$$[U]([B]\lambda \rightarrow [E]\lambda')$$

forces λ' to be true at a unit-interval, whenever λ is true at the previous one.

To replace the binary implication trick with one using only $\mathcal{HS}_{core}^\square$ -formulas, we use the following *binary implication trick for the diagonal*. For any literals λ_1, λ_2 and λ , we define the formula $[\lambda_1 \wedge \lambda_2 \Rightarrow_H^d \lambda]$ as the conjunction of

$$[U]([B]\lambda_1 \rightarrow [E][\tilde{B}]\tilde{\lambda}),$$

$$[U]([B]\lambda_2 \rightarrow [E]\tilde{\lambda}),$$

$$[U]([A]\tilde{\lambda} \rightarrow \lambda),$$

where $\tilde{\lambda}$ is a fresh variable. Then we clearly have the following:

CLAIM 4.4. *Suppose \mathfrak{M} satisfies $[\lambda_1 \wedge \lambda_2 \Rightarrow_H^d \lambda]$. If $\mathfrak{M}, \langle u_n, u_n \rangle \models \lambda_1 \wedge \lambda_2$ then $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, u_{n+1} \rangle \models \lambda$ for all $x \leq u_{n+1}$.*

Soundness: Observe again that to satisfy $[\lambda_1 \wedge \lambda_2 \Rightarrow_H^d \lambda]$ it is necessary that λ is horizontally stable in the model, and λ_1, λ_2 also satisfy certain conditions.

Now suppose that \mathcal{A} is a Turing machine whose computation with empty input uses $< \text{poly}(\text{size}(\mathcal{A}))$ tape cells for some polynomial function $\text{poly}()$, and let $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}^d$ be the conjunction of (23), (24), (37), (38), (39), and the following formulas:

$$[U](\text{cell}_i^{(q,s)} \rightarrow \text{unit}), \quad \text{for } i < N, (q, s) \in Q \times (\Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\}),$$

and for all $(q, s) \in (Q - \{q_f\}) \times (\Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\})$ and $z \in \Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\}$,

– if $\delta_{\mathcal{A}}(q, s) = (q', s')$, then take the conjunction of

$$[U]([B]\text{cell}_i^{(q,s)} \rightarrow [E]\text{cell}_i^{(q',s')}), \quad \text{for } i < N,$$

$$[\text{cell}_i^{(q,s)} \wedge \text{cell}_j^z \Rightarrow_H^d \text{cell}_j^z], \quad \text{for } i, j < N, j \neq i;$$

– if $\delta_{\mathcal{A}}(q, s) = (q', R)$, then take the conjunction of

$$[U]([B]\text{cell}_i^{(q,s)} \rightarrow [E]\text{cell}_i^s), \quad \text{for } i < N - 1, \quad (40)$$

$$[\text{cell}_i^{(q,s)} \wedge \text{cell}_{i+1}^z \Rightarrow_H^d \text{cell}_{i+1}^{(q',z)}], \quad \text{for } i < N - 1,$$

$$[\text{cell}_i^{(q,s)} \wedge \text{cell}_j^z \Rightarrow_H^d \text{cell}_j^z], \quad \text{for } i < N - 1, j < N, j \neq i, i + 1;$$

– if $\delta_{\mathcal{A}}(q, s) = (q', L)$, then take the conjunction of (40) for $0 < i < N$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & [\text{cell}_i^{(q,s)} \wedge \text{cell}_{i-1}^z \Rightarrow_H^d \text{cell}_{i-1}^{(q',z)}], & \text{for } 0 < i < N, \\ & [\text{cell}_i^{(q,s)} \wedge \text{cell}_j^z \Rightarrow_H^d \text{cell}_j^z], & \text{for } 0 < i < N, j < N, j \neq i, i-1. \end{aligned}$$

We then clearly have the following:

CLAIM 4.5. *If $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}^d$ is satisfiable in an \mathcal{HS} -model based on a discrete linear order, then \mathcal{A} diverges with empty input.*

On the other hand, it is straightforward to see that if \mathcal{A} diverges with empty input, then $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}^d$ is satisfiable (using the irreflexive semantics) in any \mathcal{HS} -model that is based on a discrete linear order \mathfrak{T} containing an infinite ascending chain of subsequent points. The case when \mathfrak{T} contains an infinite descending chain of immediate predecessor points requires ‘symmetrical versions’ of the used formulas and is left to the reader.

(ii) We reduce ‘PSpace-bound halting’ to $\text{Fin}(<)$ -satisfiability. To achieve this, we omit the conjunct (37) from $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}^d$ above, and replace (39) with

$$[\cup](\text{cell}_i^{(q,s)} \rightarrow \neg[A] \text{unit}), \quad \text{for } i < N, (q, s) \in (Q - \{q_f\}) \times (\Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\}),$$

in order to force the computation to reach the halting state. □

4.3 Undecidability

In our undecidability proofs, we ‘represent’ Turing machine computations on the $nw_{\omega \times \omega}$ -grid as follows. Given any Turing machine \mathcal{A} , observe that for any computation of \mathcal{A} in the n th step the head can never move further than the n th cell. If \mathcal{A} starts with empty input, this means that $\mathcal{C}_n(m) = \sqcup$ for all $n < H$ and $n < m < \omega$. Because of this we may actually assume that \mathcal{C}_n is not of infinite length but of *finite* length $n + 2$. (This way $\mathcal{C}_0 = ((q_0, \mathcal{L}), \sqcup)$, and \mathcal{A} never visits the last cell of any \mathcal{C}_n , so it is always \sqcup .) So we can place the subsequent finite configurations of the computation on the subsequent horizontal *lines* of the $nw_{\omega \times \omega}$ -grid, continuously one after another (until we reach \mathcal{C}_{H-2} , if $H < \omega$), as depicted in Fig. 5.




Figure 5: Placing the computation of \mathcal{A} on the $nw_{\omega \times \omega}$ -grid.

Observe also that only the active cell and its neighbours can be changed by the transition to the next configuration, while all other cells remain the same. So instead of using the transition function $\delta_{\mathcal{A}}$, we can have the same information in the form of a ‘triples to cells’ function $\tau_{\mathcal{A}}$ defined as follows. Let $\Gamma_{\mathcal{A}} = \Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\} \cup (Q \times (\Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\}))$ and let $W_{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \Gamma_{\mathcal{A}} \times \Gamma_{\mathcal{A}} \times \Gamma_{\mathcal{A}}$ consist of those triples that can occur as three subsequent cells in the continuous enumeration of the configurations of the computation, that is, let

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\mathcal{A}} = & ((Q^- \times \Sigma) \times \Sigma \times \Sigma) \cup (\Sigma \times (Q^- \times \Sigma) \times \Sigma) \cup (\Sigma \times \Sigma \times (Q^- \times \Sigma)) \cup \\ & (LEnd \times \Sigma \times \Sigma) \cup (\{\sqcup\} \times LEnd \times \Sigma) \cup (\Sigma \times \{\sqcup\} \times LEnd) \cup \{((q_0, \mathcal{L}), \sqcup, \mathcal{L})\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $Q^- = Q - \{q_f\}$ and $L\text{End} = \{\mathcal{L}\} \cup (Q^- \times \{\mathcal{L}\})$. We define a function $\tau_{\mathcal{A}} : W_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \Gamma_{\mathcal{A}}$ by taking, for all $(x, y, z) \in W_{\mathcal{A}}$,

$$\tau_{\mathcal{A}}(x, y, z) = \begin{cases} (q', y), & \text{if either } x \in (Q - \{q_f\}) \times (\Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\}) \text{ and } \delta_{\mathcal{A}}(x) = (q', \text{R}), \\ & \text{or } z \in (Q - \{q_f\}) \times \Sigma \text{ and } \delta_{\mathcal{A}}(z) = (q', \text{L}), \\ (q', y'), & \text{if } y \in (Q - \{q_f\}) \times \Sigma \text{ and } \delta_{\mathcal{A}}(y) = (q', y'), \\ y' & \text{if } y = (q, y') \text{ and } \delta_{\mathcal{A}}(y) = (q', \text{M}) \text{ for } \text{M} = \text{L}, \text{R}, \\ y, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (41)$$

Then it is easy to see that $\tau_{\mathcal{A}}$ indeed determines the computation of \mathcal{A} , that is, for all $0 < n < H$, $\mathcal{C}_n(n+1) = \sqcup$ and for all $m \leq n$,

$$\mathcal{C}_n(m) = \begin{cases} \tau_{\mathcal{A}}(\sqcup, \mathcal{C}_{n-1}(0), \mathcal{C}_{n-1}(1)), & \text{if } m = 0, \\ \tau_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}_{n-1}(m-1), \mathcal{C}_{n-1}(m), \mathcal{C}_{n-1}(m+1)), & \text{if } 0 < m < n, \\ \tau_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}_{n-1}(n-1), \sqcup, \mathcal{C}_n(0)), & \text{if } m = n. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 9. ($\mathcal{H}\mathcal{S}_{\text{horn}}^{\diamond}$ *arbitrary semantics*)

(i) For any class \mathcal{C} of linear orders containing an infinite order, \mathcal{C} -satisfiability of $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{S}_{\text{horn}}^{\diamond}$ -formulas is undecidable. (ii) Fin-satisfiability of $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{S}_{\text{horn}}^{\diamond}$ -formulas is undecidable.

Proof. (i) We reduce ‘non-halting’ to \mathcal{C} -satisfiability. We discuss only the case when \mathcal{C} contains some linear order \mathfrak{T} having an infinite ascending chain. (The case when \mathfrak{T} contains an infinite descending chain requires ‘symmetrical versions’ of the used formulas and it is left to the reader.)

To make the main ideas more transparent, first we assume the *irreflexive semantics* for the interval relations, and then we show how to modify the proof for *arbitrary semantics*. Take any $\mathcal{H}\mathcal{S}$ -model \mathfrak{M} based on some linear order \mathfrak{T} . We begin with forcing a *unique* infinite unit-sequence in \mathfrak{M} , using the conjunction of (29) and

$$\text{unit} \wedge [\text{U}](\text{unit} \rightarrow \langle \text{A} \rangle \text{unit}), \quad (42)$$

$$[\text{U}](\text{unit} \rightarrow \neg \langle \text{E} \rangle \text{unit} \wedge \neg \langle \bar{\text{B}} \rangle \text{unit} \wedge \neg \langle \text{D} \rangle \text{unit} \wedge \neg \langle \text{O} \rangle \text{unit}). \quad (43)$$

Then it is straightforward to show the following:

CLAIM 4.6. *Let ϕ_{enum} be the conjunction of (29), (42) and (43), and suppose that $\mathfrak{M}, \langle r, r' \rangle \models \phi_{\text{enum}}$. Then there is an infinite sequence $u_0 < u_1 < \dots < u_n < \dots$ of points in \mathfrak{T} such that for all $r \leq x$ and all $r' \leq x'$, we have $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, x' \rangle \models \text{unit}$ iff $x = u_n$ and $x' = u_{n+1}$ for some $n < \omega$.*

Next, we use this unit-sequence to encode the enumeration of the $n\omega \times \omega$ -grid depicted in Fig. 4. Observe that for this particular enumeration the right-neighbour of a grid-location is the next one in the enumeration. As we generated our unit-sequence with (42), we have access from one unit-interval to the next by the A interval relation. So, to encode the $n\omega \times \omega$ -grid, it is enough to use ‘up-pointers’. We force the proper placement of ‘up-pointers’ in a particular way, by using the following properties of this enumeration:

- (a.1) 0 is on the diagonal, and $\text{up_neighbour_of}(0) = 1$.
- (a.2) If n is on the diagonal, then $\text{up_neighbour_of}(n) + 1$ is on the diagonal, for every $n < B$.
- (a.3) If n is the up-neighbour of some location, then n is not on the diagonal, for every $n < B$.
- (a.4) If n is not on the diagonal, then $\text{up_neighbour_of}(n+1) = \text{up_neighbour_of}(n) + 1$, for every $n+1 < B$.
- (a.5) If n is on the diagonal, then $\text{up_neighbour_of}(n+1) = \text{up_neighbour_of}(n) + 2$, for every $n+1 < B$.

CLAIM 4.7. *Properties (a.1)–(a.5) uniquely determine⁴ the enumeration in Fig. 4.*

⁴among those that contain the enumeration of the diagonal locations as $(0, 0), \dots, (1, 1), \dots, (2, 2), \dots$

Proof. We prove by induction on $n < B$ that for every $k \leq n$,

(i) $k = \langle x, y \rangle$ is like it should be in Fig. 4.

(ii) k is on the diagonal iff $k = (x, x)$ for some x .

Indeed, for $n = 1$ (i) follows from (a.1), and (b) follows from (a.3). Now suppose inductively that (i)–(ii) hold for all $k \leq n$ for some $0 < n < B$, and let $n + 1 < B$. There are three cases.

If n is on the diagonal, then by IH(ii), $n = (x, x)$ for some $x > 0$. Let $m = (x - 1, x - 1)$. Then $m < n$ by IH(i) and so by IH(ii), m is on the diagonal. So by (a.5), $n + 1 = \text{up_neighbour_of}(m + 1)$, proving (i). Now (ii) follows from (a.3).

If n is not on the diagonal and $n = (x, y)$ for some y and $x < y - 1$, then let $m = (x, y - 1)$. Then $m < n$ by IH (i) and so by IH (ii), m is not on the diagonal. So by (a.4), $n + 1 = \text{up_neighbour_of}(m + 1)$, proving (i). Now (ii) follows from (a.3).

If n is not on the diagonal and $n = (y - 1, y)$ for some y , then let $m = (y - 1, y - 1)$. Then $m < n$ by IH(i) and so by IH(ii), m is on the diagonal. By (a.2), $n + 1$ is on the diagonal, so it should be the next ‘unused’ diagonal location, which is (y, y) , proving both (i) and (ii). \square

Next, given a unique infinite unit-sequence $\mathcal{U} = (\langle u_n, u_{n+1} \rangle \mid n < \omega)$ as in Claim 4.6 above, we express ‘horizontal’ and ‘vertical next-time’ in \mathfrak{M} ‘with respect to \mathcal{U} ’. Given literals λ_1 and λ_2 , let $\text{grid_succ}_{\rightarrow}[\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$ denote the conjunction of

$$\begin{aligned} & [\text{U}](\lambda_1 \rightarrow \neg\langle \text{E} \rangle \lambda_1) \wedge [\text{U}](\lambda_2 \rightarrow \neg\langle \text{E} \rangle \lambda_2), \\ & [\text{U}](\lambda_1 \rightarrow \langle \text{E} \rangle \lambda_2), \\ & [\text{U}](\lambda_1 \rightarrow [\text{E}](\langle \text{E} \rangle \lambda_2 \rightarrow \neg\langle \text{B} \rangle \text{unit})), \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

and similarly, let $\text{grid_succ}_{\uparrow}[\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$ denote the conjunction of

$$\begin{aligned} & [\text{U}](\lambda_1 \rightarrow \neg\langle \bar{\text{B}} \rangle \lambda_1) \wedge [\text{U}](\lambda_2 \rightarrow \neg\langle \bar{\text{B}} \rangle \lambda_2), \\ & [\text{U}](\lambda_1 \rightarrow \langle \bar{\text{B}} \rangle \lambda_2), \\ & [\text{U}](\lambda_1 \rightarrow [\bar{\text{B}}](\langle \bar{\text{B}} \rangle \lambda_2 \rightarrow \neg\langle \text{E} \rangle \text{unit})). \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

It is straightforward to show the following:

CLAIM 4.8. *Suppose $\mathfrak{M}, \langle u_m, u_n \rangle \models \lambda_1$ for some $m, n < \omega$.*

- *Suppose \mathfrak{M} satisfies $\text{grid_succ}_{\rightarrow}[\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$. Then, for all x , $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, u_n \rangle \models \lambda_2$ iff $x = u_{m+1}$, and $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, u_n \rangle \models \lambda_1$ iff $x = u_m$.*
- *Suppose \mathfrak{M} satisfies $\text{grid_succ}_{\uparrow}[\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$. Then, for all y , $\mathfrak{M}, \langle u_m, y \rangle \models \lambda_2$ iff $y = u_{n+1}$, and $\mathfrak{M}, \langle u_m, y \rangle \models \lambda_1$ iff $y = u_n$.*

Now we can encode (a.1)–(a.5) as follows. We use a propositional variable up to mark up-pointers, variables diag and $\bar{\text{diag}}$ to mark those respective unit-points that are on the diagonal and not on the diagonal, and further fresh variables now , up_{\uparrow} , up_{\rightarrow} , up^+ (see Fig. 6 for the intended placement of the variables). Then we express (a.1) by the conjunction of

$$\text{unit} \wedge \text{diag} \wedge \text{now}, \tag{46}$$

$$\text{grid_succ}_{\uparrow}[\text{now}, \text{up}], \tag{47}$$

(a.2) by the conjunction of

$$\text{grid_succ}_{\uparrow}[\text{up}, \text{up}_{\uparrow}], \tag{48}$$

$$[\text{U}](\text{unit} \wedge \text{diag} \rightarrow [\bar{\text{B}}](\text{up}_{\uparrow} \rightarrow [\text{E}](\text{unit} \rightarrow \text{diag}))), \tag{49}$$




Figure 6: Encoding the $nw_{\omega \times \omega}$ -grid in an \mathcal{HS} -model – version 1.

(a.3) by the conjunction of

$$[U](\text{up} \rightarrow [E](\text{unit} \rightarrow \overline{\text{diag}})), \quad (50)$$

$$[U](\text{diag} \wedge \overline{\text{diag}} \rightarrow \perp), \quad (51)$$

(a.4) by

$$[U]\left(\text{unit} \wedge \overline{\text{diag}} \rightarrow [\bar{B}](\text{up}_{\uparrow} \rightarrow [E](\text{up}_{\rightarrow} \rightarrow \text{up}))\right), \quad (52)$$

and (a.5) by the conjunction of

$$\text{grid_succ}_{\rightarrow}[\text{up}_{\uparrow}, \text{up}_{\rightarrow}], \quad (53)$$

$$\text{grid_succ}_{\uparrow}[\text{up}_{\rightarrow}, \text{up}^+], \quad (54)$$

$$[U]\left[\text{unit} \wedge \text{diag} \rightarrow [\bar{B}]\left(\text{up}_{\uparrow} \rightarrow [E](\text{up}_{\rightarrow} \rightarrow [\bar{B}](\text{up}^+ \rightarrow \text{up}))\right)\right]. \quad (55)$$

It is not hard to show the following:

CLAIM 4.9. *Suppose $\mathfrak{M}, \langle r, r' \rangle \models \phi_{\text{enum}} \wedge \phi_{\text{grid}}$, where ϕ_{grid} is the conjunction of (46)–(55). Then now, diag , $\overline{\text{diag}}$ and up are properly placed (see Fig. 6).*

Given a Turing machine \mathcal{A} , we will use the function $\tau_{\mathcal{A}}$ (defined in (41)) to force a diverging computation of \mathcal{A} with empty input as follows. We introduce (with a slight abuse of notation) a propositional variable x for each $x \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{A}}$. Then we formulate general constraints as

$$[U](x \rightarrow \text{unit}), \quad \text{for } x \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{A}}, \quad (56)$$

$$[U](x \rightarrow \neg y), \quad \text{for } x \neq y, x, y \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{A}}, \quad (57)$$

and then force the computation steps by the conjunction of

$$\langle A \rangle(q_0, \mathcal{L}), \quad (58)$$

$$[U](\text{diag} \rightarrow \perp), \quad (59)$$

$$[U]\left(y \wedge \langle A \rangle z \wedge \langle \bar{A} \rangle x \rightarrow [\bar{B}](\text{up} \rightarrow [E](\text{unit} \rightarrow \tau_{\mathcal{A}}(x, y, z)))\right), \quad \text{for } (x, y, z) \in W_{\mathcal{A}}. \quad (60)$$

Finally, we force non-halting with

$$[\mathbf{U}]((q_f, s) \rightarrow \perp), \quad \text{for } s \in \Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\}. \quad (61)$$

Using Claims 4.6–4.9, now it is straightforward to prove the following:

CLAIM 4.10. *Let $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the conjunction of ϕ_{enum} , ϕ_{grid} and (56)–(61). If $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}$ is satisfiable in an \mathcal{HS} -model, then \mathcal{A} diverges with empty input.*

On the other hand, Fig. 6 shows how to satisfy $\phi_{enum} \wedge \phi_{grid}$ (using the irreflexive semantics) in an \mathcal{HS} -model that is based on some linear order \mathfrak{T} having an infinite ascending chain $u_0 < u_1 < \dots$. If \mathcal{A} diverges with empty input, then we can add, for all $x \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{A}}$,

$$\nu(x) = \{\langle u_{n-1}, u_n \rangle \mid n > 0, \mathcal{C}_j(i) = x \text{ and the } n\text{th point in the grid-enumeration is } (i, j + 1)\} \quad (62)$$

to obtain an \mathcal{HS} -model $\mathfrak{M} = (\mathfrak{T}_{\mathfrak{x}}, \nu)$ satisfying (56)–(61) as well.

Next, we show how to modify the formula $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}$ above in order to be satisfiable with arbitrary semantics of the interval relations. ‘Uniqueness forcing’ constraints like (43), (44), and (45) above are clearly not satisfiable with the reflexive semantics. Expanding on an idea of [44], [42, 23, 24] use the following *chessboard trick* to solve this problem and kind of ‘discretise’ the \mathcal{HS} -model. Take two fresh propositional variables Htick and Vtick , and make the \mathcal{HS} -model \mathfrak{M} ‘chessboard-like’ by the formula

$$[\mathbf{U}](\text{Htick} \rightarrow [\bar{\mathbf{B}}]\text{Htick}) \wedge [\mathbf{U}](\text{Vtick} \rightarrow [\mathbf{E}]\text{Vtick}). \quad (63)$$

However, to make it a real chessboard, we also need to have ‘cover’ by these variables and their negations, that is, for every interval in \mathfrak{M} , $\text{Htick} \vee \neg \text{Htick}$ and $\text{Vtick} \vee \neg \text{Vtick}$ should hold. In order to express these by $\mathcal{HS}_{hom}^{\diamond}$ -formulas, we use the following *cover trick* of [3, p. 11]. For any literals λ and $\bar{\lambda}$, let $\text{Cover}_{\leftrightarrow}[\lambda, \bar{\lambda}]$ denote the conjunction of

$$\begin{aligned} & [\mathbf{U}](\top \rightarrow \langle \bar{\mathbf{B}} \rangle (\mathbf{M}_{\lambda} \wedge \langle \mathbf{E} \rangle \mathbf{X}_{\lambda} \wedge \langle \mathbf{E} \rangle \mathbf{Y}_{\lambda})), \\ & [\mathbf{U}](\mathbf{X}_{\lambda} \wedge \mathbf{Y}_{\lambda} \rightarrow \perp), \\ & [\mathbf{U}](\langle \bar{\mathbf{B}} \rangle (\mathbf{M}_{\lambda} \wedge \langle \mathbf{E} \rangle (\mathbf{Y}_{\lambda} \wedge \langle \mathbf{E} \rangle \mathbf{X}_{\lambda})) \rightarrow \lambda), \\ & [\mathbf{U}](\langle \bar{\mathbf{B}} \rangle (\mathbf{M}_{\lambda} \wedge \langle \mathbf{E} \rangle (\mathbf{X}_{\lambda} \wedge \langle \mathbf{E} \rangle \mathbf{Y}_{\lambda})) \rightarrow \bar{\lambda}), \\ & [\mathbf{U}](\lambda \wedge \bar{\lambda} \rightarrow \perp), \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

where \mathbf{M}_{λ} , \mathbf{X}_{λ} , and \mathbf{Y}_{λ} are fresh variables.

Soundness: Observe that $\text{Cover}_{\leftrightarrow}[\lambda, \bar{\lambda}]$ forces the model to be infinite. Also, it always implies that both λ and $\bar{\lambda}$ are vertically stable, that is,

$$[\mathbf{U}](\lambda \rightarrow [\bar{\mathbf{B}}]\lambda) \wedge [\mathbf{U}](\bar{\lambda} \rightarrow [\bar{\mathbf{B}}]\bar{\lambda}).$$

holds. We can define $\text{Cover}_{\uparrow}[\lambda, \bar{\lambda}]$ similarly, for horizontally stable λ and $\bar{\lambda}$. Now we take fresh variables $\overline{\text{Htick}}$ and $\overline{\text{Vtick}}$, and define *Chessboard* by taking

$$\text{Chessboard} := \text{Cover}_{\leftrightarrow}[\text{Htick}, \overline{\text{Htick}}] \wedge \text{Cover}_{\uparrow}[\text{Vtick}, \overline{\text{Vtick}}]. \quad (65)$$

Then (63) and the similar formula for $\overline{\text{Htick}}$ and $\overline{\text{Vtick}}$ follow. Suppose that \mathfrak{M} is an \mathcal{HS} -model based on some linear order $\mathfrak{T} = (T, \leq)$ satisfying *Chessboard*. We define two new binary relations $\prec_{\rightarrow}^{\mathfrak{M}}$ and $\prec_{\uparrow}^{\mathfrak{M}}$ on T by taking, for all $u, v \in T$,

$$\begin{aligned} u \prec_{\rightarrow}^{\mathfrak{M}} v \quad & \text{iff} \quad \exists z \left(u \leq z \leq v \text{ and} \right. \\ & \left. \forall y \left(\text{if } \langle z, y \rangle \text{ is in } \mathfrak{M}, \text{ then } (\mathfrak{M}, \langle u, y \rangle \models \text{Htick} \leftrightarrow \mathfrak{M}, \langle z, y \rangle \models \neg \text{Htick}) \right) \right); \\ u \prec_{\uparrow}^{\mathfrak{M}} v \quad & \text{iff} \quad \exists z \left(u \leq z \leq v \text{ and} \right. \\ & \left. \forall x \left(\text{if } \langle x, u \rangle \text{ is in } \mathfrak{M}, \text{ then } (\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, u \rangle \models \text{Vtick} \leftrightarrow \mathfrak{M}, \langle x, z \rangle \models \neg \text{Vtick}) \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then it is straightforward to check that both $\prec_{\uparrow}^{\mathfrak{M}}$ and $\prec_{\downarrow}^{\mathfrak{M}}$ imply \leq , and both are transitive and irreflexive. (They are not necessarily linear orders.) We call a non-empty subset $I \subseteq T$ a *horizontal \mathfrak{M} -interval* (shortly, an *h-interval*), if I is maximal with the following two properties:

- for all $x, y, z \in T$, if $x \leq y \leq z$ and $x, z \in I$ then $y \in I$;
- either $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models \text{Htick}$, for all $x \in I$ and $y \in T$ such that $\langle x, y \rangle$ is in \mathfrak{M} , or $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models \neg \text{Htick}$, for all $x \in I$ and $y \in T$ such that $\langle x, y \rangle$ is in \mathfrak{M} .

For any $x \in T$, let $h_int(x)$ denote the unique h-interval I with $x \in I$. We define *v-intervals* and $v_int(x)$ similarly, using $\prec_{\uparrow}^{\mathfrak{M}}$. A set S of the form $S = I \times J$ for some h-interval I and v-interval J is called a *square*. For any $\langle x, y \rangle$ in \mathfrak{M} , let $square(x, y)$ denote the unique square S with $\langle x, y \rangle \in S$.

Now we define horizontal and vertical successor squares. Given propositional variables P and Q , let $\text{succ_sq}_{\rightarrow}[P, Q]$ be the conjunction of

$$[U](P \wedge \text{Htick} \rightarrow \langle E \rangle (Q \wedge \overline{\text{Htick}})), \quad (66)$$

$$[U](P \wedge \overline{P} \rightarrow \perp),$$

$$[U](P \wedge \text{Htick} \rightarrow [E] P'), \quad (67)$$

$$[U](P' \wedge \overline{\text{Htick}} \rightarrow (\overline{P} \wedge [E] \overline{P})),$$

$$[U](Q \wedge \overline{Q} \rightarrow \perp),$$

$$[U](Q \wedge \text{Htick} \rightarrow [E] Q'),$$

$$[U](Q' \wedge \text{Htick} \rightarrow (\overline{Q} \wedge [E] \overline{Q})),$$

$$[U](P' \wedge \text{Htick} \wedge \langle E \rangle (Q \wedge \overline{\text{Htick}}) \rightarrow P), \quad (68)$$

$$[U](P' \wedge \overline{\text{Htick}} \wedge \langle E \rangle Q \rightarrow Q), \quad (69)$$

$$[U](Q \wedge \langle E \rangle^+ P \rightarrow \perp), \quad (70)$$

plus similar formulas for the ' $P \wedge \overline{\text{Htick}}$ ' case (here \overline{P} , \overline{Q} , P' and Q' are fresh variables). One can define $\text{succ_sq}_{\uparrow}[P, Q]$ similarly. Finally, we let

$$\text{fill}[P] = \text{succ_sq}_{\rightarrow}[P_l, P] \wedge \text{succ_sq}_{\rightarrow}[P, P_r] \wedge \text{succ_sq}_{\uparrow}[P_d, P] \wedge \text{succ_sq}_{\uparrow}[P, P_u],$$

where $P_l, P_r, P_d,$ and P_u are fresh variables.

CLAIM 4.11. *Suppose \mathfrak{M} satisfies Chessboard and $\text{succ_sq}_{\rightarrow}[P, Q]$. Then the following hold, for all x, y, z, w :*

- (i) *If $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models P$, then there is v such that $x \prec_{\rightarrow}^{\mathfrak{M}} v$ and $\mathfrak{M}, \langle v, y \rangle \models Q$.*
- (ii) *If $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models P$ and $x \prec_{\rightarrow}^{\mathfrak{M}} z$, then $\mathfrak{M}, \langle z, y \rangle \not\models P$.*
- (iii) *If $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models Q$ and $x \prec_{\rightarrow}^{\mathfrak{M}} z$, then $\mathfrak{M}, \langle z, y \rangle \not\models Q$.*
- (iv) *If $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models P$, $z \in h_int(x)$, $x \leq z$, then $\mathfrak{M}, \langle z, y \rangle \models P$.*
- (v) *If $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models P$, $\mathfrak{M}, \langle z, y \rangle \models Q$, $w \in h_int(z)$ and $w \leq z$, then $\mathfrak{M}, \langle w, y \rangle \models Q$.*
- (vi) *If $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models P$ and $\mathfrak{M}, \langle z, y \rangle \models Q$, then $x \prec_{\rightarrow}^{\mathfrak{M}} z$ and there is no t with $x \prec_{\rightarrow}^{\mathfrak{M}} t \prec_{\rightarrow}^{\mathfrak{M}} z$.*

Similar statements hold if \mathfrak{M} satisfies $\text{succ_sq}_{\uparrow}[P, Q]$. Therefore,

- (vii) *if \mathfrak{M} satisfies $\text{fill}[P]$ and $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models P$ then $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x', y' \rangle \models P$ for all $\langle x', y' \rangle \in \text{square}(x, y)$.*

Proof. It is mostly straightforward. We show the trickiest case, (vi) We have $x \leq z$ by (70). Suppose, say, that $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models \text{Htick}$. By (i), there is v such that $x \prec_{\rightarrow}^{\mathfrak{M}} v$ and $\mathfrak{M}, \langle v, y \rangle \models Q$, and so $\mathfrak{M}, \langle v, y \rangle \models \overline{\text{Htick}}$. Then $z \in h_int(v)$ follows by (iii), and so $x \prec_{\rightarrow}^{\mathfrak{M}} z$. Now let t be such that $x \leq t \leq z$. If $\mathfrak{M}, \langle t, y \rangle \models \text{Htick}$, then $\mathfrak{M}, \langle t, y \rangle \models P$ by (67) and (68), and so $t \in h_int(x)$ by (ii). If $\mathfrak{M}, \langle t, y \rangle \models \overline{\text{Htick}}$, then $\mathfrak{M}, \langle t, y \rangle \models Q$ by (67) and (69), and so $t \in h_int(z)$ by (iii). \square

Soundness: If \mathfrak{M} satisfies $\text{fill}[P]$ then P must be both ‘horizontally and vertically square-unique’ in the following sense: if $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models P$ and $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x', y' \rangle \models P$ for some $x \prec_{\rightarrow}^{\mathfrak{M}} x'$ and $y \prec_{\uparrow}^{\mathfrak{M}} y'$, then $\text{square}(x, y) = \text{square}(x', y')$ must follow.

Now, using this ‘chessboard trick’, we can modify the formula $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}$ above for any semantical choice of the interval relations. To begin with, instead of using ϕ_{enum} , we force a unique infinite sequence of unit-squares by introducing a fresh variable next , and taking the conjunction ϕ_{enum}^r of the following formulas:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Chessboard} \wedge \text{fill}[\text{unit}] \wedge \text{fill}[\text{next}], \\ & \text{unit} \wedge \text{succ_sq}_{\rightarrow}[\text{unit}, \text{next}], \\ & \text{succ_sq}_{\uparrow}[\text{next}, \text{unit}]. \end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

Then we have the following generalisation of Claim 4.6:

CLAIM 4.12. *Suppose $\mathfrak{M}, \langle r, r' \rangle \models \phi_{\text{enum}}^r$. Then there exist infinite sequences $(x_n \mid n < \omega)$ and $(y_n \mid n < \omega)$ of points in \mathfrak{T} such that the following hold:*

- (i) $r = x_0 \prec_{\rightarrow}^{\mathfrak{M}} x_1 \prec_{\rightarrow}^{\mathfrak{M}} \dots \prec_{\rightarrow}^{\mathfrak{M}} a_n \prec_{\rightarrow}^{\mathfrak{M}} \dots$ and $r' = y_0 \prec_{\uparrow}^{\mathfrak{M}} y_1 \prec_{\uparrow}^{\mathfrak{M}} \dots \prec_{\uparrow}^{\mathfrak{M}} y_n \prec_{\uparrow}^{\mathfrak{M}} \dots$
- (ii) *There is no x with $x_n \prec_{\rightarrow}^{\mathfrak{M}} x \prec_{\rightarrow}^{\mathfrak{M}} x_{n+1}$ and there is no y with $y_n \prec_{\uparrow}^{\mathfrak{M}} y \prec_{\uparrow}^{\mathfrak{M}} y_{n+1}$, for any $n < \omega$.*
- (iii) *For all x, y , $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models \text{unit}$ iff $\langle x, y \rangle \in \text{square}(x_n, y_n)$ for some $n < \omega$.*

In order to show the soundness of ϕ_{enum}^r , let $\mathfrak{T} = (T, \leq)$ be a linear order containing an infinite ascending chain $u_0 < u_1 < \dots$

CLAIM 4.13. *ϕ_{enum}^r is satisfiable in an \mathcal{HS} -model based on \mathfrak{T} under arbitrary semantics.*

Proof. For each $n < \omega$, we let

$$U_n = \{x \in T \mid u_n \leq x < u_{n+1}\}.$$

It is straightforward to check that the following \mathcal{HS} -model $\mathfrak{M} = (\mathfrak{T}_{\mathfrak{T}}, \nu)$ satisfies $\text{Cover}_{\leftrightarrow}[\text{Htick}, \overline{\text{Htick}}]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\text{Htick}) &= \{\langle x, y \rangle \in \text{int}(\mathfrak{T}) \mid x \in U_n, n \text{ is even}\}, \\ \nu(\overline{\text{Htick}}) &= \{\langle x, y \rangle \in \text{int}(\mathfrak{T}) \mid x \in U_n, n \text{ is odd}\}, \\ \nu(\text{M}_{\text{Htick}}) &= \{\langle x, y \rangle \in \text{int}(\mathfrak{T}) \mid x \in U_m, y \in U_n, \text{ both } m, n \text{ are even, or both } m, n \text{ are odd}\}, \\ \nu(\text{X}_{\text{Htick}}) &= \{\langle x, y \rangle \in \text{int}(\mathfrak{T}) \mid x \in U_n, y \in U_{n+1} \cup U_{n+2}, n \text{ is even}\}, \\ \nu(\text{Y}_{\text{Htick}}) &= \{\langle x, y \rangle \in \text{int}(\mathfrak{T}) \mid x \in U_n, y \in U_{n+1} \cup U_{n+2}, n \text{ is odd}\}. \end{aligned}$$

$\text{Cover}_{\uparrow}[\text{Vtick}, \overline{\text{Vtick}}]$ can be satisfied similarly. The rest is obvious. \square

Next, consider the formula ϕ_{grid} defined in Claim 4.9. Let ϕ_{grid}^r be obtained from ϕ_{grid} by replacing each occurrence of $\text{grid_succ}_{\rightarrow}$ by $\text{succ_sq}_{\rightarrow}$ and each occurrence of $\text{grid_succ}_{\uparrow}$ by $\text{succ_sq}_{\uparrow}$, and adding the conjuncts $\text{fill}[P]$ for $P \in \{\text{now}, \text{unit}, \text{diag}, \overline{\text{diag}}, \text{up}, \text{up}_{\uparrow}, \text{up}_{\rightarrow}, \text{up}^+\}$. Using Claim 4.12, it is straightforward to show that we have the analogue of Claim 4.9 for squares.

Finally, given a Turing machine \mathcal{A} , let $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^r$ be the conjunction of ϕ_{enum}^r , ϕ_{grid}^r , (56)–(61), and $\text{fill}[x]$ for each $x \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{A}}$. Then we have:

CLAIM 4.14. *If $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^r$ is satisfiable in an \mathcal{HS} -model, then \mathcal{A} diverges with empty input.*

On the other hand, using Fig. 6, Claim 4.13 and (62) it is easy to show how to satisfy $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^r$ in an \mathcal{HS} -model that is based on some linear order \mathfrak{T} having an infinite ascending chain $u_0 < u_1 < \dots$, regardless which semantics of the interval relations is considered.

(ii) We reduce ‘halting’ to Fin-satisfiability. We show how to modify the formula $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^r$ above to achieve this. To begin with, ‘generating’ conjuncts like (64) and its ‘vertical’ version in Chessboard, and (66) and its $\overline{\text{Htick}}$ version in $\text{succ_sq}_{\rightarrow}[\text{unit}, \text{next}]$ of (71) are not satisfiable in \mathcal{HS} -models based on finite orders.

In order to obtain a finitely satisfiable version, we introduce a fresh variable end , replace (61) with the conjunction of

$$[\text{U}](\text{end} \rightarrow \text{unit}), \quad (72)$$

$$[\text{U}](\text{end} \wedge x \rightarrow \perp), \quad \text{for } x \in \Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\} \cup (Q^- \times (\Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\})), \quad (73)$$

then replace conjunct (64) in $\text{Cover}_{\leftrightarrow}[\lambda, \bar{\lambda}]$ with the conjunction of

$$[\text{U}](\langle R \rangle \text{end} \rightarrow \langle \bar{B} \rangle (M_\lambda \wedge \langle E \rangle X_\lambda \wedge \langle E \rangle Y_\lambda)), \quad \text{for } R \in \{A, \bar{B}, \bar{D}, L, O\},$$

(and similarly in $\text{Cover}_{\uparrow}[\lambda, \bar{\lambda}]$), and then replace conjunct (66) in $\text{succ_sq}_{\rightarrow}[\text{unit}, \text{next}]$ with the conjunction of

$$[\text{U}](\langle R \rangle \text{end} \wedge \text{unit} \wedge \text{Htick} \rightarrow \langle E \rangle (\text{next} \wedge \overline{\text{Htick}})), \quad \text{for } R \in \{A, \bar{B}, \bar{D}, L, O\}$$

(and do similarly for the ‘ $\overline{\text{Htick}}$ -version’, and for the ‘generating’ conjuncts in $\text{succ_sq}_{\uparrow}[\text{next}, \text{unit}]$). \square

Theorem 10. ($\mathcal{HS}_{\text{core}}$, *irreflexive semantics*)

(i) For any class \mathcal{C} of linear orders containing an infinite order, $\mathcal{C}(\langle \cdot \rangle)$ -satisfiability of $\mathcal{HS}_{\text{core}}$ -formulas is undecidable. (ii) $\text{Fin}(\langle \cdot \rangle)$ -satisfiability of $\mathcal{HS}_{\text{core}}$ -formulas is undecidable.

Proof. (i) We reduce ‘non-halting’ to $\mathcal{C}(\langle \cdot \rangle)$ -satisfiability. Given an \mathcal{HS} -model \mathfrak{M} based on some linear order \mathfrak{T} , observe that the formula ϕ_{enum} (defined in Claim 4.6) that forces a unique infinite unit-sequence $(\langle u_n, u_{n+1} \rangle \mid n < \omega)$ in \mathfrak{M} is within $\mathcal{HS}_{\text{core}}$. However, the formula ϕ_{grid} (defined in Claim 4.9) we used in the proof of Theorem 9 to encode the $nw_{\omega \times \omega}$ -grid in \mathfrak{M} with the help of properly placed up-pointers contains several seemingly ‘non- $\mathcal{HS}_{\text{core}}$ -able’ conjuncts. In order to fix this, below we will force the proper placement of up-pointers in a different way.

Consider again the enumeration of $nw_{\omega \times \omega}$ in Fig. 4. Observe that the enumerated points can be organized in (horizontal) *lines*: $\text{line}_1 = (1, 2)$, $\text{line}_2 = (3, 4, 5)$, $\text{line}_3 = (6, 7, 8, 9)$, and so on. Consider the following properties of this enumeration (different from the ones listed as (a.1)–(a.5) in the proof of Theorem 9 above):

- (b.1) $\text{start_of}(\text{line}_1) = 1$, and $\text{up_neighbour_of}(0) = 1$.
- (b.2) $\text{start_of}(\text{line}_{i+1}) = \text{end_of}(\text{line}_i) + 1$, for all $i > 0$.
- (b.3) Every line starts with some n on the wall and ends with some m on the diagonal.
- (b.4) If n is in line_i , then $\text{up_neighbour_of}(n)$ is in line_{i+1} , for all i .
- (b.5) For every m, n , if $m < n$ then $\text{up_neighbour_of}(m) < \text{up_neighbour_of}(n)$.
- (b.6) For every $n > 0$ on the wall, there is m with $\text{up_neighbour_of}(m) = n$.
- (b.7) For every n , if n is neither on the wall nor on the diagonal, then there is m with $\text{up_neighbour_of}(m) = n$.

Observe that (b.1) and (b.2) imply that every n in the enumeration belongs to line_i for some i . Also, by (b.2) and (b.3), for every i there is a unique m in line_i that is on the diagonal (its last according to the enumeration). As up_neighbour_of is an injective function, by (b.4) we have that

$$\text{number of points in line}_i \leq \text{number of points in line}_{i+1}.$$

Further, by (b.4), (b.6) and (b.7),

$$\text{number of non-diagonal points in line}_{i+1} \leq \text{number of points in line}_i.$$

Therefore,

$$\text{length_of}(\text{line}_{i+1}) = \text{length_of}(\text{line}_i) + 1 \text{ for all } i.$$

Finally, by (b.4) and (b.5) we obtain that line_i is what it should be in Fig. 4, and so we have:

CLAIM 4.15. Properties (b.1)–(b.7) uniquely determine⁵ the enumeration in Fig. 4.

Given a unique infinite unit-sequence $\mathcal{U} = (\langle u_n, u_{n+1} \rangle \mid n < \omega)$ in \mathfrak{M} as in Claim 4.6 above, we now encode (b.1)–(b.7) as follows. In addition to up, diag, and now, we will also use a variable wall to mark those unit-points that are on the wall, and a variable line to mark lines in the following sense: $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models \text{line}$ iff $x = u_m, y = u_n$ and $(m + 1, \dots, n)$ is a line (see Fig. 7 for the intended placement of the variables).




Figure 7: Encoding the $nw_{\omega \times \omega}$ -grid in an \mathcal{HS} -model – version 2.

To begin with, we express that up_neighbour_of is an injective function by

$$[U](\text{up} \rightarrow \neg \langle E \rangle \text{up} \wedge \neg \langle \bar{B} \rangle \text{up}), \quad (74)$$

then we express (b.1) by the conjunction of

$$\text{now} \wedge \langle A \rangle \text{line}, \quad (75)$$

$$[U](\text{up} \rightarrow \neg \langle D \rangle \text{now}), \quad (76)$$

(b.2) by

$$[U](\text{line} \rightarrow \langle A \rangle \text{line}), \quad (77)$$

(b.3) by the conjunction of

$$[U](\text{wall} \rightarrow \text{unit}), \quad (78)$$

$$[U](\text{diag} \rightarrow \text{unit}), \quad (79)$$

$$[U](\text{line} \rightarrow \langle E \rangle \text{diag} \wedge \langle B \rangle \text{wall}), \quad (80)$$

⁵among those that contain the enumeration of the diagonal locations as $(0, 0), \dots, (1, 1), \dots, (2, 2), \dots$

(b.4) by the conjunction of

$$[\mathbf{U}](\text{unit} \rightarrow \langle \bar{\mathbf{B}} \rangle \text{up}), \quad (81)$$

$$[\mathbf{U}](\text{up} \rightarrow \langle \mathbf{E} \rangle \text{unit} \wedge \langle \mathbf{B} \rangle \text{unit}), \quad (82)$$

$$[\mathbf{U}](\text{up} \rightarrow \neg \langle \bar{\mathbf{B}} \rangle \text{line} \wedge \neg \langle \mathbf{D} \rangle \text{line}), \quad (83)$$

(b.5) by

$$[\mathbf{U}](\text{up} \rightarrow \neg \langle \mathbf{D} \rangle \text{up}), \quad (84)$$

(b.6) by

$$[\mathbf{U}](\text{wall} \rightarrow \langle \bar{\mathbf{E}} \rangle \text{up}). \quad (85)$$

Finally, we can express (b.7) by

$$[\langle \bar{\mathbf{D}} \rangle \text{line} \wedge \text{unit} \Rightarrow_H \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle \langle \bar{\mathbf{A}} \rangle \text{up}], \quad (86)$$

using the ‘binary implication trick’ introduced in Subsection 4.2.

Now it is not hard to show the following:

CLAIM 4.16. *Suppose $\mathfrak{M}, \langle r, r' \rangle \models \phi_{\text{enum}} \wedge \phi_{\text{grid}}^{\text{core}}$, where $\phi_{\text{grid}}^{\text{core}}$ is a conjunction of (74)–(86). Then now, wall, diag, line, and up are properly placed (see Fig. 7).*

On the other hand, using Fig. 7 it is not hard to see that $\phi_{\text{grid}}^{\text{core}}$ is satisfiable (using the irreflexive semantics) in an \mathcal{HS} -model that is based on some linear order \mathfrak{T} having an infinite ascending chain $u_0 < u_1 < \dots$. In particular, conjunct (86) is satisfiable because of the following: $\langle \mathbf{A} \rangle \langle \bar{\mathbf{A}} \rangle \text{up}$ is clearly horizontally stable, and it is easy to check that for every x, n with $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, u_n \rangle \models \neg \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle \langle \bar{\mathbf{A}} \rangle \text{up}$, we have $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, u_n \rangle \models \neg \langle \bar{\mathbf{D}} \rangle \text{line}$.

Given a Turing machine \mathcal{A} , consider the conjuncts (56)–(61) above, and observe that the only non- $\mathcal{HS}_{\text{core}}$ conjuncts among them are (60) for $(x, y, z) \in W_{\mathcal{A}}$. In order to replace these with $\mathcal{HS}_{\text{core}}$ -formulas we introduce the following fresh propositional variables:

- (y, z) and $\overline{(y, z)}$, for all $y, z \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{A}}$, and
- (x, y, z) and $\overline{(x, y, z)}$, for all $(x, y, z) \in W_{\mathcal{A}}$.

Then we again use the ‘binary implication trick’ of Subsection 4.2, and take the conjunction of the following formulas, for all $y, z \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{A}}$ and all $(x, y, z) \in W_{\mathcal{A}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} & [\langle \bar{\mathbf{A}} \rangle y \wedge z \Rightarrow_V \overline{(y, z)}], \\ & [\mathbf{U}](\overline{(y, z)} \rightarrow \langle \bar{\mathbf{A}} \rangle (y, z)), \\ & [\mathbf{U}]((y, z) \rightarrow \text{unit}), \\ & [\langle \mathbf{A} \rangle (y, z) \wedge x \Rightarrow_H \overline{(x, y, z)}], \\ & [\mathbf{U}](\overline{(x, y, z)} \rightarrow \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle (x, y, z)), \\ & [\mathbf{U}]((x, y, z) \rightarrow \text{up} \wedge \langle \mathbf{E} \rangle \tau_{\mathcal{A}}(x, y, z)). \end{aligned}$$

Fig. 8 shows the intended meaning of these formulas, and also how to satisfy them in the \mathcal{HS} -model \mathfrak{M} defined in (62).

(ii) We reduce ‘halting’ to $\text{Fin}(<)$ -satisfiability. In order to achieve this, we introduce a fresh variable end, replace (61) with the conjunction of (72) and (73), and replace the ‘generating’ conjunct (42) of ϕ_{enum} with

$$\text{unit} \wedge [\langle \mathbf{L} \rangle \text{end} \wedge \text{unit} \Rightarrow_H \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle \text{unit}], \quad (87)$$

using the binary implication trick. \square

Theorem 11. ($\mathcal{HS}_{\text{horn}}^{\square}$, discrete orders, irreflexive semantics)

(i) For any class Dis^{∞} of discrete linear orders containing an infinite order, $\text{Dis}^{\infty}(<)$ -satisfiability of $\mathcal{HS}_{\text{horn}}^{\square}$ -formulas is undecidable. (ii) $\text{Fin}(<)$ -satisfiability of $\mathcal{HS}_{\text{horn}}^{\square}$ -formulas is undecidable.




Figure 8: Encoding the formula (60) in \mathcal{HS}_{core} .

Proof. (i) We again reduce ‘non-halting’ to the satisfiability problem. We show how to modify the techniques used in the proof of Theorems 9 and 10 in order to stay within $\mathcal{HS}_{horn}^\square$.

Take any \mathcal{HS} -model \mathfrak{M} based on a discrete linear order \mathfrak{T} , and consider the irreflexive semantics of the interval relations. We again want to encode the $nw_{\omega \times \omega}$ -grid in \mathfrak{M} using the enumeration in Fig. 4. To begin with, in this case there is no need to ‘generate’ a unique infinite unit-sequence (which we cannot do without positive $\langle R \rangle$ s), as we obtain such ‘out of the box’ with the conjunction ϕ_{enum}^\square of

$$\begin{aligned} & [\mathbf{U}](\text{unit} \rightarrow \neg[\bar{\mathbf{B}}]\perp), \\ & [\mathbf{U}](\text{unit} \rightarrow \neg[\mathbf{E}]\perp \wedge [\mathbf{E}][\mathbf{E}]\perp) \wedge [\mathbf{U}](\langle \mathbf{E} \rangle[\mathbf{E}]\perp \wedge [\mathbf{E}][\mathbf{E}]\perp \rightarrow \text{unit}). \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

It is not hard to see that if \mathfrak{M} satisfies ϕ_{enum}^\square then there is an infinite sequence $u_0 < u_1 < \dots < u_n < \dots$ of subsequent points in \mathfrak{T} such that for all x, x' with $x \leq u_n, x' \leq u_m$ for some $n, m < \omega$, we have $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, x' \rangle \models \text{unit}$ iff $x = u_i$ and $x' = u_{i+1}$ for some $i < \omega$. (Note that this is not the same unit-sequence as in the proof of Theorem 8.) This unit-sequence has the useful property of having access to the ‘next’ and ‘previous’ unit-intervals with the \mathbf{A} and $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ interval relations, respectively. The following *nw-next trick* will also be essential in working with this unit-sequence. For any finite conjunction φ of literals and any literal λ , we define the formula $[\varphi \Rightarrow \odot \lambda]$ as the conjunction of

$$\begin{aligned} & [\mathbf{U}](\varphi \rightarrow \lambda_\downarrow \wedge [\mathbf{B}]\lambda_\downarrow \wedge [\bar{\mathbf{B}}]\lambda_\uparrow), \\ & [\mathbf{U}](\lambda_\uparrow \wedge [\mathbf{B}]\lambda_\downarrow \rightarrow \lambda_*), \\ & [\mathbf{U}](\lambda_* \rightarrow \lambda_\rightarrow \wedge [\mathbf{E}]\lambda_\rightarrow \wedge [\bar{\mathbf{E}}]\lambda_\leftarrow), \\ & [\mathbf{U}](\lambda_\leftarrow \wedge [\mathbf{E}]\lambda_\rightarrow \rightarrow \lambda), \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_\downarrow, \lambda_\uparrow, \lambda_\rightarrow, \lambda_\leftarrow$ and λ_* are fresh variables. It is easy to see the following:

CLAIM 4.17. *If $\mathfrak{M} \models [\varphi \Rightarrow \odot \lambda]$ and $\mathfrak{M}, \langle u_i, u_j \rangle \models \varphi$, then $\mathfrak{M}, \langle u_{i-1}, u_{j+1} \rangle \models \lambda$.*

Soundness: Observe that in order to satisfy $[\varphi \Rightarrow \odot \lambda]$ there are certain restrictions on φ and λ . For example, there is no problem whenever they are both ‘horizontally and vertically unique in \mathfrak{M} ’ in the following sense: If $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y \rangle \models \varphi$ then $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x', y \rangle \not\models \varphi$ and $\mathfrak{M}, \langle x, y' \rangle \not\models \varphi$ for any $x' \neq x, y' \neq y$ (and similarly for λ).

Next, we force the proper placement of line- and up-pointers of the $nw_{\omega \times \omega}$ -grid in Fig. 4 in a novel way, different from the ones in the proofs of Theorems 9 and 10. In representing this enumeration by our unit-sequence, each line will be followed by a ‘mirror’-unit, then by a ‘mirrored copy’ of the next line with its locations listed in reverse order, and then by a proper listing of the next line’s locations. In order to achieve this, we introduce the following fresh propositional variables:

- grid_proper, wall and diag (to mark those unit-intervals that represent line-locations and the respective wall- and diagonal-ends of each line);
- grid_copy (to mark unit-intervals representing the mirror-copies of proper line locations);
- up and mirror (to mark pointers helping to access the up-neighbour of each location);
- first_mirror, last_mirror and last_up (to mark the beginning and end of each ‘north-west going’ mirror- and up-sequence, respectively).

See Fig. 9 for the intended placement of these variables, and for an example of how to access, say, grid-location $(1, 4)$ from $(1, 3)$, and $(1, 3)$ from $(1, 2)$ with the help of up- and mirror-pointers.

We force the proper placement of these variables by the conjunction ϕ_{grid}^{\square} of the following formulas:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{init} \wedge [\text{init} \Rightarrow \textcircled{\times} \text{last_up}], \\
& [\text{U}](\text{init} \rightarrow \text{unit} \wedge \text{wall}), \\
& [\text{U}](\text{unit} \wedge \langle \bar{\text{E}} \rangle \text{last_up} \rightarrow \text{diag}), \\
& [\text{U}](\text{diag} \rightarrow [\text{A}](\text{unit} \rightarrow \text{first_mirror})), \\
& [\text{first_mirror} \Rightarrow \textcircled{\times} \text{mirror}], \\
& [\text{wall} \Rightarrow \textcircled{\times} \text{up}], \\
& [\text{U}](\text{unit} \wedge \langle \bar{\text{E}} \rangle \text{up} \rightarrow \text{grid_proper}), \\
& [\text{mirror} \wedge \langle \text{B} \rangle \text{grid_proper} \Rightarrow \textcircled{\times} \text{mirror}], \\
& [\text{U}](\text{mirror} \wedge \langle \text{B} \rangle \text{wall} \rightarrow \text{last_mirror}), \\
& [\text{U}](\text{unit} \wedge \langle \bar{\text{E}} \rangle \text{mirror} \rightarrow \text{grid_copy}), \\
& [\text{U}](\text{unit} \wedge \langle \bar{\text{E}} \rangle \text{last_mirror} \rightarrow \text{wall}), \\
& [\text{up} \wedge \langle \text{B} \rangle \text{grid_copy} \Rightarrow \textcircled{\times} \text{up}], \\
& [\text{U}](\text{up} \wedge \langle \text{B} \rangle \text{first_mirror} \rightarrow \text{last_up}).
\end{aligned}$$

Then it is not hard to show the following:

CLAIM 4.18. *If $\mathfrak{M}, \langle u_0, u_1 \rangle \models \phi_{enum}^{\square} \wedge \phi_{grid}^{\square}$, then all variables are placed as in Fig. 9.*

Finally, given a Turing machine \mathcal{A} , we again place the subsequent configurations of its computation with empty input on the subsequent lines of the $nw_{\omega \times \omega}$ -grid (see Fig. 5), using the function $\tau_{\mathcal{A}}$ defined in (41). We define the formula $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^{\square}$ as follows. First, we take the general constraints (56) and (57), then initialize the computation with

$$[\text{U}](\text{init} \rightarrow (q_0, \mathcal{L})),$$

and then force the computation steps with the conjunction of (59) and

$$\begin{aligned}
& [\text{U}](\text{first_mirror} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}), \\
& [\text{U}]\left(\text{grid_proper} \wedge y \wedge \langle \text{A} \rangle z \wedge \langle \bar{\text{A}} \rangle x \rightarrow [\bar{\text{B}}](\text{mirror} \rightarrow [\text{E}](\text{unit} \rightarrow \tau_{\mathcal{A}}(x, y, z)))\right), \\
& \hspace{25em} \text{for } (x, y, z) \in W_{\mathcal{A}}, \\
& [\text{U}]\left(\text{wall} \wedge y \wedge \langle \text{A} \rangle z \rightarrow [\bar{\text{B}}](\text{mirror} \rightarrow [\text{E}](\text{unit} \rightarrow \tau_{\mathcal{A}}(\perp, y, z)))\right), \quad \text{for } (\perp, y, z) \in W_{\mathcal{A}}, \\
& [\text{U}]\left(\text{grid_copy} \wedge \langle \bar{\text{B}} \rangle \text{up} \wedge x \rightarrow [\bar{\text{B}}](\text{up} \rightarrow [\text{E}](\text{unit} \rightarrow x))\right), \quad \text{for } x \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{A}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we force non-halting with (61). Using Claim 4.18, now it is straightforward to prove the following:

CLAIM 4.19. *If $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^{\square}$ is satisfiable in an \mathcal{HS} -model based on a discrete linear order, then \mathcal{A} diverges with empty input.*




Figure 9: Encoding the $nw_{\omega} \times \omega$ -grid in an \mathcal{HS} -model – version 3.

On the other hand, using Fig. 9 it is not hard to see that $\phi_{enum}^{\square} \wedge \phi_{grid}^{\square}$ is satisfiable (using the irreflexive semantics) in an \mathcal{HS} -model that is based on some discrete linear order \mathfrak{T} having an infinite ascending chain $u_0 < u_1 < \dots$ of subsequent points. If \mathcal{A} diverges with empty input, then it is not hard to modify the \mathcal{HS} -model \mathfrak{M} given in (62) to obtain a model satisfying $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}}^{\square}$. The case when \mathfrak{T} contains an infinite descending chain of immediate predecessor points requires ‘symmetrical versions’ of the used formulas and is left to the reader.

(ii) We reduce ‘halting’ to $\text{Fin}(<)$ -satisfiability. In order to achieve this, we omit (61), and replace (88) with the conjunction of

$$[\text{U}](\text{unit} \wedge x \rightarrow \neg[\bar{\text{B}}]_{\perp}), \quad \text{for } x \in \Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\} \cup ((Q - \{q_f\}) \times (\Sigma \cup \{\mathcal{L}\})).$$

This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

5 Open problems

QUESTION 1. *Is $\mathcal{HS}_{core}^{\diamond}$ -satisfiability PSPACE-hard over any class of unbounded timelines under any semantics?*

QUESTION 2. *Is $\mathcal{HS}_{core}^{\diamond}$ -satisfiability decidable over any unbounded class of timelines under any semantics?*

QUESTION 3. Is \mathcal{HS}_{core} -satisfiability decidable over any unbounded class of timelines under the reflexive semantics?

QUESTION 4. Is $\mathcal{HS}_{core}^{\square}$ -satisfiability decidable over any unbounded class of discrete timelines under the irreflexive semantics?

Acknowledgements.

The authors acknowledge the support from the Italian INDAM-GNCS project 2016 ‘Logic, Automata, and Games for Self-Adapting Systems’ (D. Bresolin, G. Sciavicco), the Spanish project TIN15-70266-C2-P-1 (E. Muñoz-Velasco), the Spanish fellowship program ‘Ramon y Cajal’ RYC-2011-07821 (G. Sciavicco), and the EPSRC UK project EP/M012670/1 ‘iTract: Islands of Tractability in Ontology-Based Data Access’ (M. Zakharyashev).

References

- [1] J. F. Allen. Maintaining knowledge about temporal intervals. *Communications of the ACM*, 26(11):832–843, 1983.
- [2] J. F. Allen. Towards a general theory of action and time. *Artificial Intelligence*, 23(2):123–154, 1984.
- [3] A. Artale, R. Kontchakov, C. Lutz, F. Wolter, and M. Zakharyashev. Temporalising tractable description logics. In *Proc. of the 20th International Symposium on Temporal Representation and Reasoning (TIME)*, pages 11–22. IEEE Computer Society, 2007.
- [4] A. Artale, R. Kontchakov, V. Ryzhikov, and M. Zakharyashev. The complexity of clausal fragments of LTL. In *Proc. of the 19th International Conference on Logic for Programming, Artificial Intelligence, and Reasoning (LPAR)*, volume 8312 of LNCS, pages 35–52. Springer, 2013.
- [5] A. Artale, R. Kontchakov, V. Ryzhikov, and M. Zakharyashev. A cookbook for temporal conceptual data modelling with description logics. *ACM Trans. Comput. Log.*, 15(3):25:1–25:50, 2014.
- [6] A. Artale, R. Kontchakov, V. Ryzhikov, and M. Zakharyashev. Tractable interval temporal propositional and description logics. In *Proc. of the 29th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-15)*, pages 1417–1423, 2015.
- [7] M. H. Böhlen, R. T. Snodgrass, and M. D. Soo. Coalescing in temporal databases. In *Proc. of the 22nd Int. Conf. on Very Large Data Bases (VLDB’96)*, pages 180–191. Morgan Kaufmann, 1996.
- [8] D. Bresolin, D. Della Monica, V. Goranko, A. Montanari, and G. Sciavicco. Decidable and undecidable fragments of Halpern and Shoham’s interval temporal logic: towards a complete classification. In *Proc. of the 15th International Conference on Logic for Programming, Artificial Intelligence, and Reasoning (LPAR)*, volume 5330 of LNCS, pages 590–604. Springer, 2008.
- [9] D. Bresolin, D. Della Monica, A. Montanari, P. Sala, and G. Sciavicco. Interval temporal logics over finite linear orders: the complete picture. In *Proc. of the 20th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence (ECAI)*, pages 199–204, 2012.
- [10] D. Bresolin, D. Della Monica, A. Montanari, P. Sala, and G. Sciavicco. Interval temporal logics over strongly discrete linear orders: the complete picture. In *Proc. of the 4th International Symposium on Games, Automata, Logics, and Formal Verification (GANDALF)*, volume 96 of EPTCS, pages 155–169, 2012.
- [11] D. Bresolin, D. Della Monica, A. Montanari, P. Sala, and G. Sciavicco. On the complexity of fragments of the modal logic of allen’s relations over dense structures. In *Proc. of the 9th International Conference on Language and Automata Theory and Applications (LATA)*, LNCS. Springer, 2015. To appear.

- [12] D. Bresolin, D. Della Monica, A. Montanari, and G. Sciavicco. The light side of interval temporal logic: the Bernays–Schönfinkel fragment of CDT. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence*, 71(1-3):11–39, 2014.
- [13] D. Bresolin, E. Muñoz-Velasco, and G. Sciavicco. Sub-propositional fragments of the interval temporal logic of Allen’s relations. In *Proc. of the 14th European Conference on Logics in Artificial Intelligence (JELIA 2014)*, pages 122–136, 2014.
- [14] A. Cau, R. Hale, J. Dimitrov, H. Zedan, B. C. Moszkowski, M. Manjunathaiah, and M. Spivey. A compositional framework for hardware/software co-design. *Design Autom. for Emb. Sys.*, 6(4):367–399, 2002.
- [15] A. Chagrov and M. Zakharyashev. *Modal Logic*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1997.
- [16] Z. Chaochen and M. R. Hansen. *Duration Calculus: A Formal Approach to Real-Time Systems*. EATCS: Monographs in Theoretical Computer Science. Springer, 2004.
- [17] C. Chen and I. Lin. The computational complexity of the satisfiability of modal horn clauses for modal propositional logics. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 129(1):95–121, 1994.
- [18] C.-C. Chen and I.-P. Lin. The computational complexity of satisfiability of temporal Horn formulas in propositional linear-time temporal logic. *Information Processing Letters*, 45(3):131–136, 1993.
- [19] A. Cimatti, M. Roveri, and S. Tonetta. HRELTL: A temporal logic for hybrid systems. *Inf. Comput.*, 245:54–71, 2015.
- [20] E. Dantsin, T. Eiter, G. Gottlob, and A. Voronkov. Complexity and expressive power of logic programming. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 33(3):374–425, 2001.
- [21] D. Della Monica, V. Goranko, A. Montanari, and G. Sciavicco. Interval Temporal Logics: a Journey. *Bulletin of the EATCS*, 105, October 2011.
- [22] L. Fariñas Del Cerro and M. Penttonen. A note on the complexity of the satisfiability of modal Horn clauses. *Journal of Logic Programming*, 4(1):1–10, 1987.
- [23] D. Gabbay, A. Kurucz, F. Wolter, and M. Zakharyashev. *Many-Dimensional Modal Logics: theory and applications*, volume 148 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. Elsevier Science Publishers, 2003.
- [24] D. Gabelaia, A. Kurucz, F. Wolter, and M. Zakharyashev. Products of ‘transitive’ modal logics. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 70:993–1021, 2005.
- [25] M. C. Golumbic and R. Shamir. Complexity and algorithms for reasoning about time: A graph-theoretic approach. *J. ACM*, 40(5):1108–1133, 1993.
- [26] V. Goranko and M. Otto. *Handbook of Modal Logic*, chapter Model Theory of Modal Logic, pages 255–325. Elsevier, 2006.
- [27] J. Halpern and Y. Shoham. A propositional modal logic of time intervals. *Journal of the ACM*, 38(4):935–962, 1991.
- [28] I. Hodkinson, A. Montanari, and G. Sciavicco. Non-finite axiomatizability and undecidability of interval temporal logics with C, D, and T. In *Proc. of the 17th Conference of the European Association Computer Science Logic*, volume 5213 of *LNCS*, pages 308–322. Springer, 2008.
- [29] U. Hustadt, B. Motik, and U. Sattler. Reasoning in description logics by a reduction to disjunctive datalog. *J. Autom. Reasoning*, 39(3):351–384, 2007.
- [30] M. Krötzsch, S. Rudolph, and P. Hitzler. Complexities of horn description logics. *ACM Trans. Comput. Log.*, 14(1):2, 2013.

- [31] K. G. Kulkarni and J. Michels. Temporal features in SQL: 2011. *SIGMOD Record*, 41(3):34–43, 2012.
- [32] C. Lutz, F. Wolter, and M. Zakharyashev. Temporal description logics: A survey. In *Proc. of the 15th Int. Symposium on Temporal Representation and Reasoning (TIME 08)*, pages 3–14. IEEE Computer Society, 2008.
- [33] J. Marcinkowski and J. Michaliszyn. The undecidability of the logic of subintervals. *Fundam. Inform.*, 131(2):217–240, 2014.
- [34] M. Marx and M. Reynolds. Undecidability of compass logic. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 9(6):897–914, 1999.
- [35] A. Montanari, I. Pratt-Hartmann, and P. Sala. Decidability of the logics of the reflexive sub-interval and super-interval relations over finite linear orders. In *Proc. of the 17th International Symposium on Temporal Representation and Reasoning (TIME)*, pages 27–34. IEEE Computer Society, 2010.
- [36] A. Montanari, G. Puppis, and P. Sala. Maximal decidable fragments of Halpern and Shoham’s modal logic of intervals. In *Proc. of the 37th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming - Part II (ICALP)*, volume 6199 of *LNCS*, pages 345–356. Springer, 2010.
- [37] A. Montanari, G. Sciavicco, and N. Vitacolonna. Decidability of interval temporal logics over split-frames via granularity. In *Proc. of the 8th European Conference on Logics in Artificial Intelligence (JELIA)*, volume 2424 of *LNAI*, pages 259–270. Springer, 2002.
- [38] B. M. Moret. *The Theory of Computation*. Addison-Wesley, 1998.
- [39] E. Muñoz-Velasco, M. Pelegrín-García, P. Sala, and G. Sciavicco. On coarser interval temporal logics and their satisfiability problem. In J. M. Puerta, J. A. Gámez, B. Dorronsoro, E. Barrenechea, A. Troncoso, B. Baruque, and M. Galar, editors, *Advances in Artificial Intelligence - 16th Conference of the Spanish Association for Artificial Intelligence, CAEPIA 2015, Albacete, Spain, November 9-12, 2015, Proceedings*, volume 9422 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 105–115. Springer, 2015.
- [40] L. Nguyen. On the complexity of fragments of modal logics. *Advances in Modal Logic*, 5:318–330, 2004.
- [41] I. Pratt-Hartmann. Temporal prepositions and their logic. *Artificial Intelligence*, 166(1–2):1–36, 2005.
- [42] M. Reynolds and M. Zakharyashev. On the products of linear modal logics. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 11(6):909–931, 2001.
- [43] T. Schwentick and T. Zeume. Two-variable logic with two order relations. In A. Dawar and H. Veith, editors, *Computer Science Logic*, volume 6247 of *LNCS*, pages 499–513. Springer, 2010.
- [44] E. Spaan. *Complexity of Modal Logics*. PhD thesis, Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Amsterdam, 1993.
- [45] P. Terenziani and R. T. Snodgrass. Reconciling point-based and interval-based semantics in temporal relational databases: A treatment of the Telic/Atelic distinction. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, 16(5):540–551, 2004.
- [46] Y. Venema. Expressiveness and completeness of an interval tense logic. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, 31(4):529–547, 1990.
- [47] Y. Venema. A modal logic for chopping intervals. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 1(4):453–476, 1991.
- [48] W3C OWL Working Group. Owl 2 web ontology language document overview. <http://www.w3.org/TR/owl2-overview/>, 2012.