

Commenced Publication in 1973

Founding and Former Series Editors:

Gerhard Goos, Juris Hartmanis, and Jan van Leeuwen

Editorial Board

David Hutchison, UK

Josef Kittler, UK

Friedemann Mattern, Switzerland

Moni Naor, Israel

Bernhard Steffen, Germany

Doug Tygar, USA

Takeo Kanade, USA

Jon M. Kleinberg, USA

John C. Mitchell, USA

C. Pandu Rangan, India

Demetri Terzopoulos, USA

Gerhard Weikum, Germany

FoLLI Publications on Logic, Language and Information

Subline of Lectures Notes in Computer Science

Subline Editors-in-Chief

Valentin Goranko, *Technical University, Lyngby, Denmark*

Michael Moortgat, *Utrecht University, The Netherlands*

Subline Area Editors

Nick Bezhanishvili, *Utrecht University, The Netherlands*

Anuj Dawar, *University of Cambridge, UK*

Philippe de Groote, *Inria-Lorraine, Nancy, France*

Gerhard Jäger, *University of Tübingen, Germany*

Fenrong Liu, *Tsinghua University, Beijing, China*

Eric Pacuit, *University of Maryland, USA*

Ruy de Queiroz, *Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Brazil*

Ram Ramanujam, *Institute of Mathematical Sciences, Chennai, India*

More information about this series at <http://www.springer.com/series/7407>

Jouko Väänänen · Åsa Hirvonen
Ruy de Queiroz (Eds.)

Logic, Language, Information, and Computation

23rd International Workshop, WoLLIC 2016
Puebla, Mexico, August 16–19th, 2016
Proceedings

Editors

Jouko Väänänen
Department of Mathematics and Statistics
University of Helsinki
Helsinki
Finland

Ruy de Queiroz
Centro de Informática
Recife, Pernambuco
Brazil

Åsa Hirvonen
Department of Mathematics and Statistics
University of Helsinki
Helsinki
Finland

ISSN 0302-9743 ISSN 1611-3349 (electronic)
Lecture Notes in Computer Science
ISBN 978-3-662-52920-1 ISBN 978-3-662-52921-8 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-3-662-52921-8

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016944475

LNCS Sublibrary: SL1 – Theoretical Computer Science and General Issues

© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2016

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made.

Printed on acid-free paper

This Springer imprint is published by Springer Nature
The registered company is Springer-Verlag GmbH Berlin Heidelberg

Preface

This volume contains the papers presented at the 23rd Workshop on Logic, Language, Information and Computation (WoLLIC 2016) held during August 16–19, 2016, at the Department of Computer Science, Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Puebla, Mexico. The WoLLIC series of workshops started in 1994 with the aim of fostering interdisciplinary research in pure and applied logic. The idea is to have a forum that is large enough in the number of possible interactions between logic and the sciences related to information and computation, and yet is small enough to allow for concrete and useful interaction among participants.

There were 41 submissions this year. Each submission was reviewed by at least three Program Committee members. The committee decided to accept 23 papers. The program also included six invited lectures by Pablo Barceló (Universidad de Chile, Chile), Dana Bartošová (University of São Paulo, Brazil), Johann A. Makowsky (Technion - Israel Institute of Technology, Israel), Alessandra Palmigiano (TU Delft, The Netherlands), Sonja Smets (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands), and Andrés Villaveces (Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Colombia). There were also five tutorials given by Barceló, Makowsky, Palmigiano, Smets, and Villaveces.

As a tribute to a recent breakthrough in mathematics, there was also a screening of Csicsery’s “Counting from Infinity: Yitang Zhang and the Twin Prime Conjecture” (2015), which centers on the life and work of Yitang Zhang in the celebrated twin prime conjecture, his result being that there are infinitely many pairs of primes separated by at most 70 million.

We would very much like to thank all Program Committee members and external reviewers for the work they put into reviewing the submissions. The help provided by the EasyChair system created by Andrei Vorokonkov is gratefully acknowledged. Finally, we would like to acknowledge the generous financial support by the Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla’s Department of Computer Science, and the scientific sponsorship of the following organizations: Interest Group in Pure and Applied Logics (IGPL), The Association for Logic, Language and Information (FoLLI), Association for Symbolic Logic (ASL), European Association for Theoretical Computer Science (EATCS), European Association for Computer Science Logic (EACSL), Sociedade Brasileira de Computação (SBC), and Sociedade Brasileira de Lógica (SBL).

May 2016

Åsa Hirvonen
Ruy de Queiroz
Jouko Väänänen

Organization

Program Committee

Samson Abramsky	Oxford University, UK
Dietmar Berwanger	CNRS and Université Paris-Saclay, France
Guram Bezhanishvili	New Mexico State University, USA
Ruy de Queiroz	Centro de Informatica, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Brazil
Arnaud Durand	Université Paris 7, France
Pietro Galliani	University of Sussex, UK
Nina Gierasimczuk	University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands
Jeroen Groenendijk	University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands
Lauri Hella	University of Tampere, Finland
Wesley Holliday	University of California, USA
Juha Kontinen	University of Helsinki, Finland
Larry Moss	Indiana University, USA
Andre Nies	University of Auckland, New Zealand
Aarne Ranta	University of Gothenburg, Sweden
Mehrnoosh Sadrzadeh	Queen Mary University of London, UK
Norma Short	Aix en Provence, France
Rineke Verbrugge	University of Groningen, The Netherlands
Heribert Vollmer	Leibniz Universität Hannover, Germany
Jouko Väänänen	University of Helsinki and University of Amsterdam, Finland and The Netherlands
Dag Westerståhl	University of Stockholm, Sweden

Tutorial/Abstracts

Ultrafilters in Dynamics and Ramsey Theory

Dana Bartošová

Department of Mathematics, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada
dana.bartosova@mail.utoronto.ca

Abstract. I will recall some famous Ramsey-type statements that admit a simple proof with the use of ultrafilter on discrete semigroups. Gowers' Ramsey theorem will be an example that up-to-date does not possess an ultrafilter-free proof. Stepping up from discrete (semi)groups to groups of automorphisms of homogeneous structures, I will show how their dynamics connects with structural Ramsey theory and how combinatorics on ultrafilters is relevant to dynamical problems. This is partially a joint work with Andrew Zucker (Carnegie Mellon University).

When is $P_{\mathfrak{A}} = NP_{\mathfrak{A}}$ over Arbitrary Structures \mathfrak{A} ? (A tutorial)

J.A. Makowsky

Department of Computer Science, Technion - Israel Institute of Technology,
Haifa, Israel

janos@cs.technion.ac.il

Abstract. In a series of lectures we review the complexity theory for computations over arbitrary relational and algebraic structures \mathfrak{A} .

We will cover the following topics:

- (i) Register machines over arbitrary relational and algebraic structures \mathfrak{A} . Some history, H. Friedman's work of the 1970 ties, [FM92]. The Blum-Shub-Smale approach to complexity, [BCSS96, BCSS98].
- (ii) What do we expect from a theory of computability over the reals? Critical evaluations, [Fef15, BC06, Mam14].
- (iii) The role of quantifier elimination: B. Poizat's characterization of $P = NP$ over \mathfrak{A} , [Poi95, Pru06].
- (iv) Proving quantifier elimination. Presburger arithmetic and the field of complex numbers. Shoenfield's quantifier elimination theorem, [KK67, Hod93].
- (v) Disproving quantifier elimination. The missing predicates.
- (vi) For which structures \mathfrak{A} can we prove $P_{\mathfrak{A}} \neq NP_{\mathfrak{A}}$? Abelian groups and boolean algebras, [Pru02, Pru03]
- (vii) The logical content of the $P = NP$ problem. Fast quantifier elimination vs. descriptive complexity, [Lib04].

Similar courses were given:

2013: At the Computer Science Department of the Technion-Israel Institute of Technology as Graduate Seminar 238900 under the title *The millennium question $P = NP$ over the real numbers*.

2014: At the 5th Indian School of Logic and Applications (ISLA-2014) at Tezpur University, Assam, India, under the title *$P =_? NP$ over arbitrary structures*.

2014: At the 26th European Summer School in Logic, Language and Information (ESSLLI 2014) in an enlarged form together with K. Meer, also under the title *$P =_? NP$ over arbitrary structures*.

See www.cs.technion.ac.il/~janos/#invitations.

References

- [BC06] Braverman, M., Cook, S.: Computing over the reals: foundations for scientific computing. *Not. AMS* **53**(3), 318–329 (2006)
- [BCSS96] Blum, L., Cucker, F., Shub, M., Smale, S.: Algebraic settings for the problem “ $P \neq NP$?”. In: *The Mathematics of Numerical Analysis*, Number 32 in *Lectures in Applied Mathematics*, pp. 125–144. Amer. Math. Soc. (1996)
- [BCSS98] Blum, L., Cucker, F., Shub, M., Smale, S.: *Complexity and Real Computation*. Springer (1998)
- [Fef15] Feferman, S.: Theses for computation and recursion on concrete and abstract structures. In: *Turing’s Revolution*, pp. 105–126. Springer (2015)
- [FM92] Friedman, H., Mansfield, R.: Algorithmic procedures. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* 297–312 (1992)
- [Hod93] Hodges, W.: *Model theory*, vol. 42. In: *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press (1993)
- [KK67] Kreisel, G., Krivine, J.L.: *Elements of Mathematical Logic: Model Theory*. North Holland (1967)
- [Lib04] Libkin, L.: *Elements of Finite Model Theory*. Springer (2004)
- [Mam14] Mamino, M.: On the computing power of $+$, $-$, and \times . In: *Proceedings of the Joint Meeting of the Twenty-Third EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic (CSL) and the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*, p. 68. ACM (2014)
- [Poi95] Poizat, B.: *Les Petits Cailloux: Une Approche Modèle-Théorique De L’algorithmie*. Aléas, Paris (1995)
- [Pru02] Prunescu, M.: A model-theoretic proof for $p \neq np$ over all infinite abelian group. *J. Symbolic Logic* **67**(01), 235–238 (2002)
- [Pru03] Prunescu, M.: $P \neq np$ for all infinite Boolean algebras. *Math. Logic Q.* **49**(2), 210–213 (2003)
- [Pru06] Prunescu, M.: Fast quantifier elimination means $p = np$. In: *Logical Approaches to Computational Barriers*, pp. 459–470. Springer (2006)

Proof Systems for the Logics for Social Behaviour

Alessandra Palmigiano

Technical University of Delft, Delft, The Netherlands

The range of ‘logics for social behaviour’ (by which I mean those logics aimed at capturing aspects such as agency and information flow) is rapidly expanding, and their theory is being intensively investigated, especially w.r.t. their semantic aspects. However, these logics typically lack a comparable proof-theoretic development. More often than not, the hurdles preventing their standard proof-theoretic development are due to the very features which make them capture essential aspects of the real world, such as their not being closed under uniform substitution, or the presence of certain extralinguistic labels and devices encoding key interactions between logical connectives [5].

In this talk I will focus on *multi-type calculi*, a methodology introduced in [3, 4, 7] to provide DEL and PDL with analytic calculi, and pursued also in [1, 2, 6].

Multi-type languages allow the upgrade of actions, agents, coalitions, etc. from *parameters* in the generation of formulas, to *terms*. Like formulas, they thus become first-class citizens of the framework, endowed with their corresponding structural connectives and rules. In this richer environment, many features which were insurmountable hurdles to the standard treatment can be understood as symptoms of the original languages of these logics lacking the necessary expressivity to encode certain key interactions *within the language*. The success of the multi-type methodology in defining analytic calculi for logics as proof-theoretically impervious as DEL lies in its providing a mathematical environment in which the expressivity problems can be clearly identified.

I will argue that multi-type calculi can provide a platform for a uniform proof-theoretic account of the logics for social behaviour.

References

1. Bilkova, M., Greco, G., Palmigiano, A., Tzimoulis, A., Wijnberg, N.: Logic of resources and capabilities (In preparation, 2016)
2. Frittella, S., Greco, G., Palmigiano, A., Yang, F.: Structural multi-type sequent calculus for inquisitive logic. In: Proceedings of the WoLLIC 2016 (2016). [arXiv:1604.00936v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/1604.00936v1)
3. Frittella, S., Greco, G., Kurz, A., Palmigiano, A.: Multi-type display calculus for propositional dynamic logic. J. Logic Comput. (2014). Special Issue on Substructural Logic and Information Dynamics

4. Frittella, S., Greco, G., Kurz, A., Palmigiano, A., Sikimić, V.: A multi-type display calculus for dynamic epistemic logic. *J. Logic Comput.* (2014). Special Issue on Substructural Logic and Information Dynamics
5. Frittella, S., Greco, G., Kurz, A., Palmigiano, A., Sikimić, V.: A proof-theoretic semantic analysis of dynamic epistemic logic. *J. Logic Comput.* (2014). Special Issue on Substructural Logic and Information Dynamics
6. Frittella, S., Greco, G., Kurz, A., Palmigiano, A., Sikimić, V.: Multi-type sequent calculi. In: *Proceedings of the Trends in Logic*, vol. XIII, pp. 81–93 (2014)
7. Greco, G., Kurz, A., Palmigiano, A.: Dynamic epistemic logic displayed. Logic, rationality and interaction. In: *Proceedings of the Fourth International Workshop. LORI 2013*

Sahlqvist Correspondence via Duality and Its Applications

Alessandra Palmigiano

Technical University of Delft, Delft, The Netherlands

Since the 1970s, correspondence theory has been one of the most important items in the toolkit of modal logicians. Unified correspondence [6] is a very recent approach, which has imported techniques from duality, algebra and formal topology [10] and exported the state of the art of correspondence theory well beyond normal modal logic, to a wide range of logics including, among others, intuitionistic and distributive lattice-based (normal modal) logics [8], non-normal (regular) modal logics [18], substructural logics [5, 7, 9], hybrid logics [13], and mu-calculus [2, 3, 4].

The breadth of this work has stimulated many and varied applications. Some are closely related to the core concerns of the theory itself, such as the understanding of the relationship between different methodologies for obtaining canonicity results [7, 17], or of the phenomenon of pseudo-correspondence [11]. Other, possibly surprising applications include the dual characterizations of classes of finite lattices [14], the identification of the syntactic shape of axioms which can be translated into analytic rules of proper display and Gentzen calculi [15, 16], and the design of display-type calculi for the logics of resources and capabilities, and their applications to the logical modelling of business organizations [1]. Finally, the insights of unified correspondence theory have made it possible to determine the extent to which the Sahlqvist theory of classes of normal DLEs can be reduced to the Sahlqvist theory of normal Boolean expansions, by means of Gödel-type translations [12].

The most important technical tools in unified correspondence are: (a) a very general syntactic definition of the class of Sahlqvist formulas, which applies uniformly to each logical signature and is given purely in terms of the order-theoretic properties of the algebraic interpretations of the logical connectives; (b) the algorithm ALBA, which effectively computes first-order correspondents of input term-inequalities, and is guaranteed to succeed on a wide class of inequalities (the so-called *inductive* inequalities) which, like the Sahlqvist class, can be defined uniformly in each mentioned signature, and which properly and significantly extends the Sahlqvist class.

In this tutorial, the fundamental principles and conceptual insights underlying these developments will be illustrated in the setting of Boolean algebras with operators [10].

References

1. Bilkova, M., Greco, G., Palmigiano, A., Tzimoulis, A., Wijnberg, N.: The logic of resources and capabilities (In preparation, 2016)
2. Conradie, W., Craig, A.: Canonicity results for mu-calculi: an algorithmic approach. J. Logic Comput. (forthcoming). [arXiv:1408.6367](https://arxiv.org/abs/1408.6367) (arXiv Preprint)

3. Conradie, W., Craig, A., Palmigiano, A., Zhao, Z.: Constructive canonicity for lattice-based fixed point logics (Submitted). [arXiv:1603.06547](#) (arXiv preprint)
4. Conradie, W., Fomatati, Y., Palmigiano, A., Sourabh, S.: Algorithmic correspondence for intuitionistic modal μ -calculus. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* **564**, 30–62 (2015)
5. Conradie, W., Frittella, S., Palmigiano, A., Piazzai, M., Tzimoulis, A., Wijnberg, N.: Categories: how I learned to stop worrying and love two sorts (Submitted). [arXiv:1604.00777](#) (arXiv preprint)
6. Conradie, W., Ghilardi, S., Palmigiano, A.: Unified correspondence. In: Baltag, A., Smets, S. (eds.) *Johan van Benthem on Logic and Information Dynamics. Outstanding Contributions to Logic*, vol. 5, pp. 933–975. Springer International Publishing (2014)
7. Conradie, W., Palmigiano, A.: Constructive canonicity of inductive inequalities (Submitted). [arXiv:1603.08341](#) (arXiv preprint)
8. Conradie, W., Palmigiano, A.: Algorithmic correspondence and canonicity for distributive modal logic. *Annals Pure Applied Logic* **163**(3), 338–376 (2012)
9. Conradie, W., Palmigiano, A.: Algorithmic correspondence and canonicity for non-distributive logics. *J. Logic Comput.* (forthcoming). [arXiv:1603.08515](#) (arXiv preprint)
10. Conradie, W., Palmigiano, A., Sourabh, S.: Algebraic modal correspondence: Sahlqvist and beyond (Submitted)
11. Conradie, W., Palmigiano, A., Sourabh, S., Zhao, Z.: Canonicity and relativized canonicity via pseudo-correspondence: an application of ALBA (Submitted). [arXiv:1511.04271](#) (arxiv preprint)
12. Conradie, W., Palmigiano, A., Zhao, Z.: Sahlqvist via translation (Submitted). [arXiv:1603.08220](#) (arXiv preprint)
13. Conradie, W., Robinson, C.: On Sahlqvist theory for hybrid logic. *J. Logic Comput.* doi:10.1093/logcom/exv045
14. Frittella, S., Palmigiano, A., Santocanale, L.: Dual characterizations for finite lattices via correspondence theory for monotone modal logic. *J. Logic Comput.* (forthcoming). [arXiv:1408.1843](#) (arXiv preprint)
15. Greco, G., Ma, M., Palmigiano, A., Tzimoulis, A., Zhao, Z.: Unified correspondence as a proof-theoretic tool. *J. Logic Comput.* (forthcoming). [arXiv:1603.08204](#) (arXiv preprint)
16. Ma, M., Zhao, Z.: Unified correspondence and proof theory for strict implication. *J. Logic Comput.* (forthcoming). [arXiv:1604.08822](#) (arXiv preprint)
17. Palmigiano, A., Sourabh, S., Zhao, Z.: Jónsson-style canonicity for ALBA-inequalities. *J. Logic Comput.* doi:10.1093/logcom/exv041
18. Palmigiano, A., Sourabh, S., Zhao, Z.: Sahlqvist theory for impossible worlds. *J. Logic Comput.* (forthcoming). [arXiv:1603.08202](#) (arXiv preprint)

Informational Cascades: A Test for Rationality?

Sonja Smets

Institute for Logic, Language and Computation,
University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Abstract. I report on joint work with A. Baltag, Z. Christoff and J.U. Hansen in [3], based on our investigation of the decision processes of individuals that lead to the social herding phenomenon known as informational cascades. The question we address in our paper deals with whether rational agents who use their higher-order reasoning powers and who can reflect on the fact that they are part of an informational cascade, can ultimately stop the cascade from happening. To answer this question we use dynamic epistemic logic to give a complete analysis of the information flow in an informational cascade, capturing the agent's observations, their communication and their higher-order reasoning power. Our models show that individual rationality isn't always a cure that can help us to stop a cascade. However, other factors that deal with the underlying communication protocol or that focus on the reliability of agents in the group, give rise to conditions that can be imposed to prevent or stop an informational cascade from happening in certain scenarios.

Informational cascades are social herding phenomena in which individual agents in a sequence decide to follow the decisions of their predecessors while simply ignoring their own private evidence. In such situations, individuals are given information about their predecessors' decisions but not about the reasons or the evidence on which these decisions are based. So when the first agents in the sequence made a correct decision, their followers will all get it right. However, the opposite can easily happen and when everyone gets it wrong we end up with a potential social-epistemic catastrophe. Such phenomena can illustrate a clear case of when social features interfere with agent's truth-tracking abilities. Hence not all situations involving communication and rational deliberation seem to be epistemically beneficial at the group level.

In this context we study the logical mechanism behind such informational cascades. It is important to note that we are looking at situations in which the total sum of private information should in principle be enough for the group to track the truth, yet in an informational cascade the group fails to do so. To gain a better understanding of this phenomenon, it is our aim to check whether this failure to track the truth can be due to any form of irrationality present when agents form or aggregate their beliefs. Our investigation is driven by questions such as: are rational and introspective agents, who reflect upon their own knowledge and beliefs and who can reason about the knowledge and beliefs of their predecessors, able to stop or prevent a cascade? Even more, are agents with unboundedly rational powers, and who are aware of the dangers of the

sequential deliberation protocol that they are part of, able to block a cascade? Indeed, in some cases a cascade can be prevented by making agents aware of it. However, as is shown in [3] this is not always the case.

There are examples of informational cascades in which no amount of higher-order reasoning is enough to stop an informational cascade. Our argument is based on a model of examples of informational cascades in [3], allowing us to represent the individual reasoning of each agent involved. Formally, we use the tools of dynamic epistemic logic [4, 5, 6, 9]. On the one hand we use a probabilistic dynamic epistemic logic to represent agents who apply probabilistic conditioning. On the other hand we also model the situation in which agents do not use sophisticated probabilistic tools but rather apply a simply non-Bayesian form of heuristic reasoning. We note that a full syntactic encoding of an informational cascade in the presence of a common knowledge operator, is offered in [2] based on a logic that combines a variant of the Logic of Communication and Change from [7] and a variant of Probabilistic Dynamic Epistemic Logic in [8].

Based on our logical analysis in [3], we conclude that cascades cannot always be avoided by rational means. Our model of unboundedly rational agents, equipped with full higher-order reasoning powers, shows that these agents (irrespective of whether they adopt Bayesian reasoning or another non-Bayesian heuristic) still end up in a cascade. Even more, the group's inability to track the truth may actually be a direct consequence of each agent's rational attempt to track the truth individually.

Investigations of different cascade scenarios point out that changes in the underlying communication protocol can make a difference. In most cascade scenarios, agents announce their decisions to their followers, i.e. they communicate about their opinions and beliefs but not about the reasons for their beliefs. Following [3], one can argue that exactly the fact that this communication protocol is based on the exchange of partial information, is the problem. Indeed allowing for more communication in which agents can share not only their beliefs but also their justifications, may stop the cascade. In ideal cases, when total communication can be achieved and agents share all their evidence, reasons, beliefs, etc., we can effectively stop a cascade. It is interesting to investigate different types of communication protocols and their effect on the formation of cascades. An analysis in which such protocols are formalised as strategies in a game theoretic setting, is provided in [1]. Further investigations point out that other social factors can similarly affect the outcome of an informational cascade. For instance the level of trust among agents in a group can make a difference. In [10] the results of an experiment are shown which indicates that agent's perceived reliability of their predecessors can affect the formation of a cascade.

Acknowledgement. Sonja Smets' research on this topic is funded by the European Research Council under the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013)/ERC Grant agreement no. 283963.

References

1. Achimescu, A.: Games and Logics for Informational Cascades. Master's thesis, ILLC University of Amsterdam, master of Logic Thesis, MoL-2014-04 (2014)
2. Achimescu, A., Baltag, A., Sack, J.: The probabilistic logic of communication and change. *J. Logic Comput.* (2016)
3. Baltag, A., Christoff, Z., Hansen, J.U., Smets, S.: Logical models of informational cascades. In: van Benthem, J., Lui, F. (eds.) *Logic across the University: Foundations and Applications*, pp. 405–432. *Studies in Logic*, College Publications (2013)
4. Baltag, A., Moss, L.: Logics for epistemic programs. *Synthese* **139**, 165–224 (2004)
5. Baltag, A., Moss, L., Solecki, S.: The logic of public announcements, common knowledge and private suspicions. In: *Proceedings of TARK 1998 (Seventh Conference on Theoretical Aspects of Rationality and Knowledge)*, pp. 43–56. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers (1998)
6. van Benthem, J.: *Logical Dynamics of Information and Interaction*. Cambridge University Press (2011)
7. van Benthem, J., Eijck, J., Kooi, B.: Logics of communication and change. *Inf. Commun.* **204**, 1620–1662 (2006)
8. van Benthem, J., Gerbrandy, J., Kooi, B.: Dynamic update with probabilities. *Stud. Logica.* **93**, 67–96 (2009)
9. van Ditmarsch, H., van der Hoek, W., Kooi, B.: Dynamic epistemic logic, vol. 337. In: *Synthese Library*, Springer, The Netherlands (2008)
10. van Weegen, L.: Informational cascades under variable reliability assessments. A formal and empirical investigation. Master's thesis, ILLC University of Amsterdam, master of Logic Thesis, MoL-2014-21 (2014)

Belief Dynamics in a Social Context

Sonja Smets

University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

This tutorial is addressed to researchers and students who are interested in the logical/philosophical study of notions of belief and knowledge, including group beliefs and collective “knowledge”. We are interested both in the representation of these different types of attitudes as well as in their dynamics, i.e. how these attitudes change in communities of interconnected agents capable of reflection, communication, reasoning, argumentation etc. I will start by introducing the basic concepts and models, using standard techniques from Dynamic Epistemic Logic and their adaptations for dealing with belief revision. I will further focus on characterizing a group’s “epistemic potential” and I touch on cases in which a group’s ability to track the truth is higher than that of each of its members. This tutorial paves the way for my invited lecture in which I focus on situations in which the group’s dynamics leads to informational distortions (i.e. the “madness of the crowds”, in particular the phenomenon of informational cascades). This tutorial is based on a number of recent papers that make use of a variety of formal tools ranging over dynamic epistemic logics, game theory and network theory.

Generalized Amalgamation Classes and Limit Models: Implicit Logics

Andrés Villaveces

Departamento de Matemáticas, Universidad Nacional de Colombia
Bogotá 111321, Colombia
avillavecesn@unal.edu.co

Abstract. This is a two-hour tutorial on two kinds of (generalized) amalgamation classes and the emergence of language (implicit logic) from their semantical properties: abstract elementary classes and sheaves of structures. I will provide definitions, examples and a description of the emergence of logic from their purely semantical properties.

- Amalgamation classes. Ordered and controlled by topologies. Examples and problems.
- Examples: sheaves of structures and abstract elementary classes with amalgamation. Orbital (Galois) types and language.
- Implicit language from semantics. The Presentation Theorem.
- Interpolation in AECs: comparing languages.

Contents

The Useful MAM, a Reasonable Implementation of the Strong λ -Calculus . . .	1
<i>Beniamino Accattoli</i>	
Compactness in Infinitary Gödel Logics	22
<i>Juan P. Aguilera</i>	
Cut Elimination for Gödel Logic with an Operator Adding a Constant.	36
<i>Juan P. Aguilera and Matthias Baaz</i>	
A Classical Propositional Logic for Reasoning About Reversible Logic Circuits	52
<i>Holger Bock Axelsen, Robert Glück, and Robin Kaarsgaard</i>	
Foundations of Mathematics: Reliability and Clarity: The Explanatory Role of Mathematical Induction	68
<i>John T. Baldwin</i>	
Justified Belief and the Topology of Evidence	83
<i>Alexandru Baltag, Nick Bezhanishvili, Aybüke Özgün, and Sonja Smets</i>	
Semantic Acyclicity for Conjunctive Queries: Approximations and Constraints	104
<i>Pablo Barceló</i>	
Expressivity of Many-Valued Modal Logics, Coalgebraically	109
<i>Marta Bilková and Matěj Dostál</i>	
Second-Order False-Belief Tasks: Analysis and Formalization	125
<i>Torben Braüner, Patrick Blackburn, and Irina Polyanskaya</i>	
Categories: How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love Two Sorts	145
<i>Willem Conradie, Sabine Frittella, Alessandra Palmigiano, Michele Piazzai, Apostolos Tzimoulis, and Nachoem M. Wijnberg</i>	
A Logical Approach to Context-Specific Independence	165
<i>Jukka Corander, Antti Hyttinen, Juha Kontinen, Johan Pensar, and Jouko Väänänen</i>	
Descriptive Complexity of Graph Spectra.	183
<i>Anuj Dawar, Simone Severini, and Octavio Zapata</i>	
Causality in Bounded Petri Nets is MSO Definable	200
<i>Mateus de Oliveira Oliveira</i>	

A Multi-type Calculus for Inquisitive Logic	215
<i>Sabine Frittella, Giuseppe Greco, Alessandra Palmigiano, and Fan Yang</i>	
A Model-Theoretic Characterization of Constant-Depth Arithmetic Circuits . . .	234
<i>Anselm Haak and Heribert Vollmer</i>	
True Concurrency of Deep Inference Proofs	249
<i>Ozan Kahramanoğulları</i>	
On the Complexity of the Equational Theory of Residuated Boolean Algebras	265
<i>Zhe Lin and Minghui Ma</i>	
Semantic Equivalence of Graph Polynomials Definable in Second Order Logic.	279
<i>Johann A. Makowsky and Elena V. Ravve</i>	
Sheaves of Metric Structures	297
<i>Maicol A. Ochoa and Andrés Villaveces</i>	
A Curry–Howard View of Basic Justification Logic	316
<i>Konstantinos Pouliasis</i>	
On the Formalization of Some Results of Context-Free Language Theory . . .	338
<i>Marcus Vinícius Midena Ramos, Ruy J.G.B. de Queiroz, Nelma Moreira, and José Carlos Bacelar Almeida</i>	
The Semantics of Corrections	358
<i>Deniz Rudin, Karl DeVries, Karen Duek, Kelsey Kraus, and Adrian Brasoveanu</i>	
The Expressive Power of k -ary Exclusion Logic	375
<i>Raine Rönnholm</i>	
Characterizing Relative Frame Definability in Team Semantics via the Universal Modality	392
<i>Katsuhiko Sano and Jonni Virtema</i>	
Negation and Partial Axiomatizations of Dependence and Independence Logic Revisited.	410
<i>Fan Yang</i>	
Anaphors and Quantifiers	432
<i>R. Zuber</i>	
Author Index	447